DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 210 612 CG 015 637

TITLE Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Act Oversight, 1981. Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, United States Senate, Ninety-Seventh Congress, First Session.

INSTITUTION Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

REPORT NO Senate-82-644-0

PUB DATE 6 Apr 81

NOTE 111p.; Pages 81-86 are of marginal legibility due to small print size.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Alcohol Education; Community Programs; *Drug Education; *Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; *Government Role; Hearings; Problem Solving; Program Descriptions; *Program Effectiveness; *School Role; State Programs; Youth Problems

IDENTIFIERS *Congress 97th

ABSTRACT

This publication contains the proceedings of the Senate Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse hearings in April 1981, which reviewed and evaluated current alcohol and drug education programs and the role of its government. Statements by government staff as well as nationwide directors of alcohol and drug education programs are provided along with descriptions of problems and solutions. In addition, several articles dealing with the efforts of public schools to deal with substance abuse and testimony supporting the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Act are presented. (JAC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION ACT OVERSIGHT, 1981

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ALCOHOLISM AND DRUG ABUSE

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

OVERSIGHT ON THE IMPACT OF THE DRUG ABUSE PROGRAM ON THE COMMUNITIES IT HAS SERVED; IS THE PROGRAM PREVENTING DRUG ABUSE; AND WHAT SHOULD BE THE FEDERAL AND STATE ROLE IN THE CONTINUATION OF THIS AND OTHER PROGRAMS

APRIL 6, 1981

ED2106612

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
82-644 O WASHINGTON : 1981

CG 015637

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah, *Chairman*

ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Vermont
DAN QUAYLE, Indiana
PAULA HAWKINS, Florida
DON NICKLES, Oklahoma
LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR., Connecticut
GORDON J. HUMPHREY, New Hampshire
JEREMIAH DENTON, Alabama
JOHN P. EAST, North Carolina

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia
HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., New Jersey
CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
THOMAS F. EAGLETON, Missouri
DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR., Michigan
HOWARD M. METZENBAUM, Ohio

ROBERT P. HUNTER, *Chief Counsel*
RENN PATCH, *Staff Director*
RITA ANN PFEIFFER, *Chief Clerk*
LAWRENCE C. HOROWITZ, M.D., *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ALCOHOLISM AND DRUG ABUSE

GORDON J. HUMPHREY, New Hampshire, *Chairman*

JEREMIAH DENTON, Alabama
ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah

DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR., Michigan
HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., New Jersey
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
(Ex Officio)

HENRY R. DESMARAIS, *Professional Staff Member*
SUSAN MANES, *Minority Professional Staff Member*

CONTENTS

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF WITNESSES

MONDAY, APRIL 6, 1981

	Page
Hays, Dick, Acting Assistant Secretary, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education and Dr. Helen Nowlis, Director, alcohol and drug abuse education program	2
Kazen, James D., Director, U.S. Department of Education, Region VII Training Center, San Antonio, Tex., and Walter H. Hollins, director of training	10
Ledford, Harold, director of Federal and State projects, Memphis City Schools.	56
Boyd, Marvin, coordinator, improvement of discipline and learning environment, Fort Worth Independent School District, Fort Worth, Tex.; Ms. Dorothy Barrick, coordinator, Teacher Center, Nashville, Tenn.; and Joseph Kaufman, superintendent, Bristol Township Schools, Bristol, Pa	60

STATEMENTS

Boyd, Marvin, coordinator, improvement of discipline and learning environment, Fort Worth Independent School District, Fort Worth, Tex.; Ms. Dorothy Barrick, coordinator, Teacher Center, Nashville, Tenn.; and Joseph Kaufman, superintendent, Bristol Township Schools, Bristol, Pa	60
Prepared statement	66
Hays, Dick, Acting Assistant Secretary, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, and Dr. Helen Nowlis, Director, alcohol and drug abuse education program	2
Hollins, Walter H., director of training, U.S. Department of Education, Region VII Training Center, San Antonio, Tex., prepared statement	32
Kaufman, Joseph S., superintendent, Bristol Township School District, Bristol, Pa., prepared statement	93
Kazen, James D., Director, U.S. Department of Education, Region VII Training Center, San Antonio, Tex., and Walter H. Hollins, director of training	10
Prepared statement	14
Ledford, Harold, director of Federal and State projects, Memphis City Schools.	56

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Articles, publications, et cetera: "School Team Approach in Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools"	81
Questions and answers: Responses of Marvin Boyd, coordinator, office of the improvement of discipline and learning environment, Fort Worth Independent School District, Fort Worth, Tex., to questions asked by Senator Humphrey	64

ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION ACT OVERSIGHT, 1981

MONDAY, APRIL 6, 1981

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ALCOHOLISM AND DRUG ABUSE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee convened, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m., in room 4232, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator Gordon J. Humphrey, (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senator Humphrey.

Senator HUMPHREY. Good morning.

This hearing of the Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse is for the purpose of reviewing and evaluating the alcohol and drug abuse education program.

We would like to extend a special welcome to our witnesses today, many of whom have traveled great distances at their own expense to educate the subcommittee on their experiences with this program.

In the past 2 weeks, this subcommittee has held two hearings focusing on alcohol and drug abuse in an effort to determine what Federal and State roles should be in addressing these devastating problems. Although there was never any doubt as to the seriousness of these problems, the hearings have made it abundantly clear that the costs to society of continued substance abuse are crippling.

It is estimated that the economic costs of alcohol misuse and alcoholism in the United States are at least $43 billion annually. Although this figure attempts to reflect the lost production, health care expenditures, motor vehicle accidents, and violent crimes, it can in no way act as a measurement of family discord, divorces, child neglect, and domestic violence alcohol abuse leaves in its wake.

The statistics on the devastation caused by drug abuse are equally shocking. The Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan recently published findings indicating that 65 percent of all high school seniors in the country report using some illicit drug during their lifetime, and 39 percent have used an illicit drug other than marihuana.

These figures indicate the level of illicit drug use among young Americans of high school age is probably higher than in any other industrialized nation in the world.

Illicit drug sales are estimated to be at least $64 billion annually. I know it is unnecessary to tell the educators gathered here today what this underground economy has done to this Nation's children and its school systems.

These staggering statistics make it evident that we need not spend time convincing each other that we have a serious problem. Our purpose here today is to explore possible solutions. Certainly the old adage, "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure," can be applied to no more critical an area than that of substance abuse. Effective prevention programs can be the source of our ultimate solution to the substance abuse problems in this country. Although numerous prevention programs are currently being implemented at all levels, including Federal, State, local, and school, our concern today is with the alcohol and drug abuse education program.

I think it is important in our examination of this program to take note of other types of school-based prevention activities and their relative merits.

The Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970 instituted the program before us today. It is my understanding that the program has evolved in the last 10 years with developments in the field of substance abuse prevention to its current form, the school team approach.

Today we would like to focus on several issues. What has been the impact of the program on the communities which it has served? Is the program indeed preventing drug abuse? And what should be the Federal and State role in the continuation of this and other programs like it.

As you know, the administration has proposed placing this program in the educational block grant structure, while the House Select Education Committee has introduced legislation to reauthorize this program as a separate entity. It is our purpose here today to explore the merits of both of these proposals and then to make our own determination as to the appropriate approach for this subcommittee to pursue.

I am confident that the witnesses this morning will give us a better understanding of the program and what its role should be in the prevention activities of the future.

Our first panel is comprised of Mr. Dick Hays, who is Acting Assistant Secretary for the Office of Educational Research and Improvement of the U.S. Department of Education and Dr. Helen Nowlis, who is the Director of the alcohol and drug abuse education program, which we are evaluating today. She has been professor of psychology and dean of students at the University of Rochester.

Good morning, Dr. Nowlis and Mr. Hays. May I ask that you summarize your statement. Your full statement, of course, will be included in the record following your oral remarks, but to leave time for questions and subsequent panels, would you please make your best effort to summarize, please.

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF DICK HAYS, ACTING ASSISTANT SECRETARY, OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, AND DR. HELEN NOWLIS, DIRECTOR, ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION PROGRAM

Mr. HAYS. Good morning, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you very much for extending an invitation to appear before your committee today to share the views of the Department of Education in its efforts to combat alcohol and drug abuse in our Nation's schools.

With your permission, I will make some brief remarks and then be available to answer any questions you may have.

Accompanying me today is Dr. Helen Nowlis, director of the Department's alcohol and drug abuse education program, who is also available to respond to any questions you may have.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we all understand that alcohol and drug abuse among our Nation's youth is a serious problem. Anyone who is a parent or who has ever worked with children and youth can attest to this. National polls repeatedly indicate that the problem is foremost in the minds of parents; a wide variety of data support these concerns, and the effects on school climate have captured the attention of teachers, school administrators, and Government officials at all levels.

The issue today is not whether we recognize that there is a problem, but rather, what the appropriate Department of Education role should be in addressing it.

During the past 10 years, the Federal Government has assisted in funding alcohol and drug abuse prevention activities in the schools. The primary objective of the Department's program on alcohol and drug abuse education has been to develop a local capacity by the schools to deal with local problems, using local resources.

Since the midseventies, the major thrust used to carry out our program objectives has been training and technical assistance to the schools. Through a network of regionally based centers, assistance has been provided to States and local school districts to aid them in defining their problems and the design and implementation of their own self-sustaining solutions. We believe that the program has grown in responsiveness. It has moved from the training of individual schools to interdisciplinary teams within schools, to clusters of teams and schools.

This past year, the program sponsored regional workshops with States and local education agencies in order to encourage networks of coordination, resource sharing and regional-based problem solving and increased communication among States. In its 10 year history, the program has reached over 2,500 schools, trained over 10,000 individuals and has had programs in all 50 States and outlying areas.

Also, there have been instances where local school districts have opted to participate in the training program at their own expense because Federal dollars were not sufficient to meet the demand.

Undoubtedly, you will be hearing much today about how effective this program has been. We are, in fact, proud of this record. It is witness to the accomplishment of the program and the responsiveness of the education community in finding effective solutions. The program has, in many ways, been a model for Federal-local relations on a problem which vitally affects education—for the definition of the problem and the strategies for its solutions are in the hands of those who know and understand it best: the people in the schools.

Our role, the Federal role, has been to stimulate local interest and to assist local districts to develop effective ways in which prevention programs can be accomplished at the State and local level. We believe we have accomplished this, and we are particularly proud that we have gone a long way in equipping schools with the necessary tools to continue on their own.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, this administration does not believe that the appropriate Federal role in education is to continue a prescriptive, categorical approach for issues which are within the traditional purview of the States. With this basic philosophy as a backdrop, it must be made clear that it is not our intention to eliminate this or any other programs included in the proposed consolidation plan. Rather, it is our intention to provide, through unencumbered resources, the support and necessary flexibility to States which will enable them to make choices about issues and the manner in which these will be carried out.

In its planning, the Department considered the uniqueness of the alcohol and drug abuse education program. Its decision to include this program in the proposed consolidation plan was based on a recognition that the severity of the problem of alcohol and drug abuse in our schools is understood by State and local governments, and that throughout the program's history, mechanisms have been put in place at the State and local level which equip the schools to combat the problem. It is now appropriate to permit the States to decide whether to address this problem and if so, how.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that you understand that this Administration is not backing away from the problem of alcohol and drug abuse. However, we firmly believe that the manner in which programs dealing with this problem are developed and carried out are best addressed by the States and localities. We therefore urge you to support our proposal for grant consolidation and not to seek a separate reauthorization for this program.

This concludes my remarks, Mr. Chairman. Dr. Nowlis and I are available for your questions.

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you, Mr. Hays.

Dr. Nowlis, did you have a statement?

Dr. NOWLIS. No. I have no statement.

Senator HUMPHREY. OK.

You realize, of course, that some of the people who are to follow you do not agree with your point of view on this block grant business. I certainly respect you for representing your superiors, if you will.

Let me play the devil's advocate for a moment here. I do not doubt, frankly, that this has been a good program, but I want to explore it a little bit. What evidence is there that this program is working? You always hear these programs described in the most glowing terms by the administrators, as a rule, and those directly involved, but oftentimes, the results do not quite match those glowing descriptions. What evidence is there that this program really is working? Of course, it is a worthy goal, but there is a difference between having a worthy goal and getting there. What evidence is there that you have gotten there?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I think we have several indicators to show that the program is working. Through the years we have had

evaluations which show us that the approach used by which Dr. Nowlis and her staff has been highly effective. In addition, we have maintained contact with a number of the sites where the programs have been implemented, and they provide us with very sound reports. If I may, I would like to ask Dr. Nowlis to amplify on this.

Dr. NOWLIS. The problem of evaluation, in the classical sense, is one that has been with us since the very beginning of the program. When you are dealing with a complex program which is different in each site because it is tailored to each site, it is very difficult to impose a typical evaluation program.

We have urged, trained and assisted local sites to develop their own evaluation system and then we get their reports. Almost across the board, schools have reported decreases in alcohol and drug abuse incidents, decreases in dropouts, decreases in vandalism, and decreases in disruptive behavior.

The other factor that makes this program difficult to evaluate is that we are talking about preventing something. We do not have actual cases that we can count. An adequate evaluation has to be a longitudinal evaluation. And, if we are intervening at the late elementary, middle school, and junior high school level, then we have to track it for 3 to 5 years. And we have never had the stability or the funds to do that. I have discussed this with our evaluation staff. I am told that in order to do a good evaluation, it would cost more than our total annual appropriation.

I think you may have to take the word of some of the people that are testifying today, and I can assure you that their experience can be duplicated across the country.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, on what scale are you reaching out into the country? You must just be barely scratching the surface. What numbers are you dealing with—2,500 schools over 10 years?

Dr. NOWLIS. There is more than that over a 10 year period, 2,500 schools have been served since we started this particular approach. Over the years, we have worked with close to 5,000 school communities. There are 16,000 school districts.

Theoretically if you are seeking a universal solution to this, you could develop something, disseminate it, and it would work. However, we know from our own experience and from the experience of others that different people are using different drugs for different reasons in different communities, and that what is exportable is a process rather than a product, and it is this process that we have been involved in developing and disseminating actively through training.

Senator HUMPHREY. So you say that you have not had the funds to properly evaluate the effect, which is certainly a credible assertion. Nevertheless, what indications do you have that these teams continue their efforts after the training?

Dr. NOWLIS. We have teams that were trained in 1972 and 1973 who are not only still active but have expanded their activities.

One of the things that we build in to the school team approach is what we call training of trainers; in other words, an attempt to develop at the local level the capacity not only to maintain, but to expand. For instance, from one team in Reno, Nev., trained in 1974, there are now teams in every school; from 1 team to 7 teams to 15 teams in Dallas, there are now teams in almost every school.

As I think you will be hearing from other witnesses that process is repeated over and over again.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, that is good, and I congratulate you for that. But what is the typical experience? In some places, obviously, these things have really caught fire. But what is typical, in your opinion?

Dr. NOWLIS. You have to realize that we are essentially dealing with an educational process, and as with all education, you have some A's, some B's, some C's, and some D's. We have a surprisingly high number of A's and B's. The great majority of the teams develop the momentum and the skills that continue, primarily because we not only train them, but we also provide them with further additional training and technical assistance over a 2-year period.

One study, completed 4 or 5 years ago, indicated that at least 80 percent of the teams were still active 1½ or 2 years later.

Senator HUMPHREY. And that is the most recent study of that kind that you have?

Dr. NOWLIS. We have a study underway right now which should be completed within the next month. We will provide the committee with a copy of the study when, it is available.

Senator HUMPHREY. But your best professional judgment is that the majority of these teams are continuing to function after, say 2 years.

Dr. NOWLIS. Well, we are working right now with teams that were trained in 1977, 1978, and 1980, and there are 450 schools with active programs.

Senator HUMPHREY. Are there any similar programs sponsored by NIAAA, or NIDA, or the Center for Disease Control?

Dr. NOWLIS. Anyone who is interested in prevention has to look at the schools. The Department of Education is in a unique position because we have access and credibility, and we really understand how schools work and how to work with them effectively. By and large, the other agencies have gone the demonstration route—in other words, they have supported demonstration programs and then disseminated information about them. We have felt very strongly that booklets, films, model programs, et cetera, do not do the job because what is really required is a basic change in the way schools relate, not only to their students, but to parents and to the community and call on resources from the community in order to help them respond to this problem.

Senator HUMPHREY. Are there representatives from parent groups included in these teams when they come to you?

Dr. NOWLIS. When we had a more substantial appropriation and could have teams of seven individuals rather than five, we specified that parent groups must be represented. Most of the people on the teams are themselves parents, and wherever possible, we strongly recommend that a member of the school board be present, and they, too, are almost always parents. But, from the very beginning, part of the training is to involve not only parents and parent organizations, but other parts of the community as well that have an impact on or a responsibility in this area.

Senator HUMPHREY. You mentioned followup, going out to these people rather than having them come to you. Did I interpret that correctly?

Dr. NOWLIS. No, we do both. We, in a sense, enter into a 2- to 3-year agreement with the school system. Starting with a cluster of four schools, we invite five people per school—an administrator, a classroom teacher, a counselor, a school health educator, a nurse—whatever they want to put together and, as I mentioned previously, we hope, a school board member. They receive, together with other clusters, and this is important because they need to understand diversity—10 days of residential training. After that, they return to their schools with an action plan, tailored to their specific problem and their resources. This is followed by onsite assistance whether it be technical assistance or further training. For instance, if part of an action plan includes peer counseling, they need more intensive training in this area than they could get in the 10-day session. So, the center sends out either staff or special consultants, depending on the need, to provide the further training and the technical assistance.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, how is your effort divided? That is, of your total budget, what percentage is devoted to regional centers and the expenses of running them, versus sending people out into the field to make contacts?

Dr. NOWLIS. I am quite proud of the fact that the regional centers are probably about as lean as any could be. For instance, their overhead is 8 percent. In this day and age, that is pretty lean. They have small staffs, and the staffs are on the road about 20 days out of 30. They are hard working and they are dedicated. There is virtually no fat in those centers, either in terms of personnel or in terms of money.

Senator HUMPHREY. It seems as though I saw in somebody's testimony that these are run on a contract basis. Is that correct?

Dr. NOWLIS. Yes.

Senator HUMPHREY. What does that mean?

Dr. NOWLIS. We write, a Request for Proposal (RFP), advertise it in the "Commerce Business Daily," evaluate the proposals received, and then award contracts for 1 year at a time, renewable for a maximum 5-year period. At the end of the 5 years we recompete.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, what kind of entities are these? Can you tell us more about that? Obviously, these are not government employees, then. This is a private organization, that you contract with.

Dr. NOWLIS. The centers are housed primarily with universities or with nonprofit organizations that are loosely affiliated with universities. In New York, it is Adelphi University. In the Southeast, it is the University of Miami. In Chicago, it is a nonprofit organization which was originally set up by the University of Chicago because they wanted a center, but would not compromise on the 8 percent overhead. Originally, in San Antonio, it was Trinity University. Now it is a nonprofit group that is a spin off from the university.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, to go back to an earlier question, because this is as much a process of education for me as anything else, so that I can understand this more clearly, what percentage of

your budget goes to these outreach programs, where the contractors leave the centers and go out and make contact again with the teams and so on; how large a factor is that?

Dr. NOWLIS. Almost all of it. The centers have overhead expenses such as rent and office management, et cetera, but the majority of those funds go for training, technical assistance, and subcontracts with local school districts that provide for travel, per diem, and substitute pay, in order to facilitate participation in the program.

Senator HUMPHREY. Do you anticipate that the regional centers will be able to continue in their present form under the block grant approach? Perhaps Mr. Hays would answer that.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, this would be up to the States. We do not have the final specifications of the consolidation proposal, but as we now understand it, it would be up to the States to decide how the money would be spent, and certainly the regional centers could be maintained if that is the decision of the States to do so.

Senator HUMPHREY. But each regional center would apparently have to go to the States it serves, and they would have to coordinate among themselves to come up with sufficient funds to keep it going?

Mr. HAYS. Yes, sir, that is correct.

Senator HUMPHREY. And is there anything to indicate that school systems will pick up the cost of sending people to these centers on their own? In the past, I guess there have been a combination of programs. In some cases, the funds were available from Washington, apparently, to pay their expenses; in other cases, they were paid locally or privately. Is that correct?

Dr. NOWLIS. In the past, the majority have been as subcontracts to the federally funded regional centers. There have been instances where school districts that were not successful in receiving Federal funds requested that they pay their own expenses in order to participate. This is something that we would encourage in the future, because the need is far greater than we can anticipate supplying.

Mr. HAYS. I think, as Dr. Nowlis indicated, that there is great deal of interest. Of course, the problem touches the local school districts, and the people there are very sensitive to those problems, and I am sure that they will find ways to deal with it. The mechanism and the process have been provided, as indicated, but when Federal money has not been sufficient, some have found alternative resources. We would expect such programs to continue.

Again, I would note that the administration is not proposing to eliminate the program, but is providing more flexibility for the States and local education agencies to make decisions about how they want to use the Federal resources that are provided.

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, I understand. But the effect is that the centers, if they are to continue, will have to be funded exclusively by the States through these block grants.

Mr. HAYS. Yes.

Senator HUMPHREY. Are there any programs, similar programs, operating within States? Do any States have programs such as these to which school systems can send teams?

Dr. NOWLIS. A couple of States have picked up our model, and California, for example, is doing much the same kind of thing.

About 6 or 7 years ago, Minnesota officials said, "This is what we want, but we need a lot more of it than you can provide," so, utilizing teams that had been trained previously and then later as single State agencies were established, Minnesota developed a very good system that now reaches most of its communities.

Other States have gone along the route to some extent but then a new administration establishes new priorities—Texas Department of Education, for instance, was very active in the early days of our program; today it is not as active.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, the program has been in existence for 7 or 8 years?

Dr. NOWLIS. The total program has been in existence for just about 10 years. The school team approach, however, started in 1974.

Senator HUMPHREY. I see. But nevertheless, even since 1974, the funding levels have been, by Federal standards, very modest. Why is that?

Dr. NOWLIS. Most people have considered alcohol and drug abuse to be a health problem and have looked to health agencies to respond. We have taken the point of view that at least prevention is a social behavioral problem which involves decisionmaking and peer groups and a lot of other things. The major support within most of the previous administrations has been for the health model. I think one of the things that we have tried to do is to demonstrate that making use of research not just about drugs, but about learning, growth, development, motivation, communication and persuasion, and dealing with an institution rather than with a client, enables us to be more effective.

Now, most administrations have not agreed with us.

Senator HUMPHREY. OK, that sums it all up. Thank you.

What about the 25-percent cut under the block grant approach, Mr. Hays? The rationale in most cases is that 25 percent savings will be achieved by elimination of the Federal role. Do you feel that that is likely to be the case here and that the net money available for spending by the States is going to be about the same?

Mr. HAYS. The President's economic recovery plan indicated that there was an expectation of a 13- to 18-percent savings in terms of overhead. This, of course, will vary from program to program. But we do feel there are savings that will be achieved through the consolidated grant approach particularly when you have a number of very small discretionary grants, which would provide the latitude and flexibility at the State level to concentrate on areas which they feel are important and to change those priorities from time to time as they see the needs within their States.

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you. We have four panels this morning, so I am afraid we are not going to have as much time as we might like to pursue this. But thank you very much, Mr. Hays for coming, and Dr. Nowlis.

The next panel is comprised of Mr. James D. Kazen and Mr. Walter H. Hollins. Mr. Kazen is director of the program's regional center in San Antonio, and Mr. Hollins is the director of training at the San Antonio regional center.

Good morning, gentlemen. Please proceed.

Your entire testimony will, of course, be included in the record following your oral remarks.

STATEMENT OF JAMES D. KAZEN, DIRECTOR, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION REGION VII TRAINING CENTER, SAN ANTONIO, TEX., AND WALTER H. HOLLINS, DIRECTOR OF TRAINING

Mr. KAZEN. I am Jim Kazen. I am the director of the regional training center in San Antonio, and with me this morning is Walter Hollins, who is our director of training for the regional training center.

We are here, of course, representing our center, but more important, I believe, representing the five regional centers that Dr. Nowlis mentioned that are located in Miami, Chicago, California, and New York.

I would like to speak candidly. My invitation said that you would like me to speak candidly about the program, and that has never been my problem, speaking candidly. Mine is more speaking diplomatically. My father, who spent a lifetime in public service, said that, "It is possible to be right and ineffective at the same time," and I think today, we need to be effective in everything we do, particularly when we describe a program that is so desperately needed and has been so cost effective and so effective in what it does.

I have been in this work for 17 years. I started as the youngest member of the district attorney's staff in San Antonio, and they gave me the great job of going down to the jail every morning before the Supreme Court decisions and talking to the men and women who had been picked up the night before, trying to get confessions. And I was struck by the fact—I was going to law school at night and doing some teaching—I was struck by the fact that 19- and 20-year-old people had already given up on life at that rather young age. And the great majority of cases that I saw were drug and alcohol related.

It seemed to me that there had to be something that could work with these young people, and I began a search that has taken me now through my adult life, looking for something that works in this problem. I am not an academic type. I began there. I began what I thought was a very successful approach. But I find myself today meeting myself coming and going.

Just recently, we have launched a new war on drugs in part of the region that I serve, and a man was standing up there, talking about the latest approach in dealing with drug and alcohol education. And when he concluded his remarks, I went up and I said, "How do you know that is going to work?"

He said, "I know it is going to work, because I have the words of an expert," and he started waving this statement. He said, "How do you know it is not going to work?" I said, "I know it is not going to work because I wrote the statement."

That is how long I have been at it, and it is probably a little bit too long, because I see some of the approaches that we dropped in the sixties coming back again, people saying, "We have got to have this; this is the latest way of doing things." And I know it does not work, because it did not work back then.

I have done everything. I have sold surveys. I have been in and out of communities. I have taken inhalants off the shelves. I have been in front of audiences. I at one time was doing a great job. I had 1,500 people coming out to hear me talk about drug and alcohol abuse, and at the end of it, I walked up to a priest who had been working with street gangs for a long time, and I said, "How am I doing?" He said, "You are doing a great job. If you are trying to be somebody, you are doing a great job. But if you are trying to do something, I do not think you are doing so well." And I think that is the difference between this program and many other things that you are going to hear. It is rather simple, with the issue of drug and alcohol abuse, to be somebody, because everybody out there is acting helpless, they are frustrated, they are sometimes angry, they are certainly angry. And it is very easy to come out and build constituents by talking about simple solutions. What is more difficult is to put something together that really works.

I guess my colleagues and I are frustrated at times, when we find something that truly does work—I started out to be at this program for 2 years, and I have been at it 10 years—it was just going to be something on the way to somewhere else. I have been in 42 States. I have been a national consultant to every State, to NIDA, to NIMH, to NIAAA, and I have never found anything that works this effectively. And the only thing we have ever lacked is a national priority to say, "Get on, and let's get this job over with."

I hope that the questions today pass beyond whether this program is just cost effective or actually, do we have statistics—although we have come prepared, I think, to show you that the program truly does work. I was encouraged by your letter that went out to the people who had just been trained, asking them to really tell you does it work. I do not know what the total response was, but we got 120 copies of letters that went to you in 1 week, and I think we could have filled up this room. I had over 50 calls from school districts asking, "How do we get out there and testify, to get somebody to hear that this thing really does work?"

I would like to talk a little bit about the difference between this program and others. For most of my 17 years, I found myself reinforcing helplessness. I would get up there and say, "Here is the answer to the problem, if you do these kinds of things," and people would clap, and I would walk out of the room. The difference between that is that we try to equip local people to look at the problem not in terms of hypothetical constructs of apathy and drugs, but look at the problem and break it down into operational language; what are we dealing with in the community? We are dealing with people who are abusing drugs, but we are not dealing with a drug problem, we are dealing with a people problem. And we try and tell the people that if there is something happening in the rest of the world, and you are in Cripple Creek, Colo., you can solve the problem. All you need is the will to do it and some resources and some skills, and you can get out there and do it, because this is not a national problem, it is not a State problem. It begins right here. It breaks down in the families and the schools. And you people can do—you can solve this problem, if you get out there and do it, if you merge your resources, if you take a look of the problem and decide as a community and as a team that you are

going to do something about it. It is a breakdown in the sense of community that results in our being unable to deal with the problem, and our training really puts that sense of community back, or tries to do it. And then we follow up that training for a year. And as Dr. Nowlis said, some of these teams have been operating since 1972. That is longer than a lot of families stick together. And they work, and they succeed. And we have some statistics that I am going to ask Walter in a minute to give you—that would take up our entire time if we went school district by school district.

But the important point that I would like to summarize and ask you to look at is that we have just scratched the surface with something that really does work. There are 16,000 school districts in the United States, and we have probably barely gotten to 1,000—not even 1,000. Out of the 87,000 schools, we may have impacted 2,500 directly and maybe 5,000 indirectly by having that school district do some internal training by itself. But this problem can be licked. We are talking about a Federal program that sees the light at the end of the tunnel, and there is not another one that I have ever been associated with that can say that.

We are talking about a program that, if we had some resources, if we had $10 million a year through the five regional training centers, we could impact 16,000 school districts in 3 years and be through with it, because I think the testimony you are going to hear is from school districts that have had intensive training, that have bought the concept, spread it out within the district, and are now dealing very successfully with the problem, and we do not have to go back there.

And I would challenge anybody to show me a Federal program that can give a timetable and say, "We would be through if we had the resources to fight the problem."

We are talking about a problem that is more than an education problem. I was visiting with some friends in the military, some generals, who were telling me of the problems with drug and alcohol abuse in the military. Fully a third of the military is believed to be hooked on drugs or alcohol. And it is understandable, because the young people that are coming out of high schools with a motivational attitudes and with very low skills, they do not get jobs, they get into the military. Now they cannot hit a target, they do not prepare to muster, their uniforms are sloppy. It is the same kind of dynamics.

And we are talking about a program at the $3 million annual appropriation? It is relatively absurd when we look at what can be done if we had decent funding.

The other thing that I think we are talking about is, if this thing goes to the block grants, we are talking about the end of a national effort, and we are talking about it at a time when private enterprise is just getting very interested in it. At the local level, everybody meets at the school. Everybody looks to the school to solve the kinds of social problems nobody else wants to touch. And we have large employers in every one of these communities who are saying, "If there is something that works out there, we may consider funding that, if the Federal Government cannot." We need 1 more year to develop an enterprise educational coalition that can go into these schools. I think if we had that, if we had a national priority,

if something came out of the Congress that said, "We are going to fund these centers and let these centers get out there and do that," you would see some remarkable things happening, because the schools could report to those large employers and those large taxpayers in the communities, and they would get out there and help us solve this problem.

And again, we are talking about a difference between a $3 million appropriation and the $10 million we need could be raised right there, but it will not be done on a State-by-State basis—not because there are not good people out there or well-intentioned people, but the States in the years I have worked with them have not yet gotten together within the States. The differences are in many States, drug and alcohol are two different agencies. In some States, drug and alcohol, health, and law enforcement are four different agencies that are dealing with the problem. They will never come together in a very short time to deal with this. We can do it at the national level by setting the priorities and then saying to the local communities, "Here is a model of a cost-effective approach that the Federal Government is encouraging you to take a look at, and it is a local program." The local communities will pick it up and we can be done with this business in 3 years, within the lifetime of many of us, which I am still encouraged that we can solve problems within our lifetime. We talk about evaluation—and I am going to ask Walter now to summarize some of that. I am not an academic type, obviously. I do not talk quietly, or anything like that. I do not talk the language. But some of these evaluations go on for years and years, and when you get through with the evaluation, the only one who reads it is another evaluator. I get very frustrated with that, because I think we have got the data right there. We could look and make some judgments right now.

One of the evaluations that went out about the school team approach years ago went out at a time where my youngest son was not born yet, when they started evaluating the school team approach. He is going to be 5 now. I guarantee you, he will be out of school before the first results come back, whether that school team approach worked in 1974.

It is not of much use to him. It is not going to be much use to me. But what is of use to us is that we have got plenty of data that a school district before we came into the community said:

> We do not know what to do with this problem. We have kids committing suicide. We have parents on our necks all day, as the principal. I do not know what to do.

And after the training and after the technical assistance and after just a few months, the communities and the schools are saying:

> We can take it from here. We are okay. We will make it from here. We do not need anymore help. Just give us a little advice on how to put some trainers together, and we have got it.

And I think that is significant. I think that is as significant as we need to look at.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Kazen follows:]

82-644 O - 81 - 2

TESTIMONY
BEFORE THE
SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE
ON
ALCOHOLISM AND DRUG ABUSE

April 6, 1981

Washington, D.C.

Testimony of:

James D. Kazen
Director

USDE Region VII Training Center
San Antonio, Texas

My name is James D. Kazen and I am the Director of the Regional Training Center located in San Antonio, Texas, funded by the Department of Education. Our Center is one of five regional centers created in 1972 by monies appropriated under the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Act. The other regional centers are located in New York City; Miami, Florida; Chicago, Illinois; and Oakland, California. I appreciate the opportunity to appear before this Committee to provide you with some firsthand information on the work of the national training network.

In a recent press conference, President Reagan called drug abuse "one of the gravest problems facing us internally in the United States." He went on to say, "Whatever we can do at the national level to try and launch a campaign nationwide...we should do...because I think we are running a risk of losing a great part of a whole generation if we don't."

I agree with the President's statement and I submit that we have an effective nationwide campaign already functioning. It is a prototype of what federal assistance to local communities should be. It has the enthusiastic endorsement of local school administrators, law enforcement officers, teachers, parents, and students. It has impacted school districts in every state of the union. It has reduced the incidences of drug and alcohol abuse in schools and in the

process energized whole communities to action. Officially it is known as the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program and it utilizes a school team training approach to foster prevention and intervention strategies in local school buildings.

The work of training and technical assistance is carried out through the five regional training centers. Each funded team receives an intensive training experience which facilitates team building, provides information about various kinds of approaches to problem solving and transmits skills to team members that will be necessary for developing and implementing a local action plan. This action plan, conceived during training and supported by the regional training center through on-site support, is the result of a team's analysis of the needs of its school community and its own resources in meeting those needs. A partnership is formed between a local school team and the regional training center for one year, during which time the center provides follow-up, on-site support and field training. The goal of such training and technical assistance is to enable the local agency to become self-sufficient and develop the capacity to identify and solve their own problems of drug and alcohol abuse.

The Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program is a prevention effort in the finest sense of that definition, for it is entirely focused on the causes of drug and alcohol abuse and

not on its symptoms. Ineffective teaching, ineffective parenting, and ineffective role modeling are some of the causes initially addressed by the school teams. Improving the school climate, reducing peer pressure, and improving skills as teachers, counselors, and administrators becomes a high priority. The problems of drug and alcohol abuse are multifaceted and so also are the solutions.

Throughout training participants are invited to consider that

- -- we are not helpless in the face of this problem unless we choose to be,
- -- a team of individuals of complementing strengths is more effective than individuals working alone,
- -- good drug and alcohol prevention is really good parenting, good teaching, and good modeling in whatever we're about,
- -- when a family or a school or a community cannot solve their own problem, it is not likely to be solved by government intervention,
- -- we serve as guides to the young only to the extent our own rhetoric and behavior is consistent,
- -- solutions to problems of human interaction begin with a sense of community,
- -- each man, each woman, and especially each child is capable of fantastic growth,

How effectively school teams accept and implement these ideas is best observed in their own testimony.

4.

The Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program is an educational program in the finest sense of the word. It enables our school administrators to take the risks associated with basic human behavior problems which government and other institutions cannot assume. It arms the teacher, coach, or counselor to face problems of chemical intoxication and disruptive behavior the likes of which were not seen in our schools twenty years ago. Lessons learned in this training will not be found in college pre-service programs, or practice teaching courses.

The Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program answers the popular call for a return to basics in education. Before we can teach reading, 'riting, and 'rithmetic we have to first get the students to the school and get them to class with their central nervous system unimpaired. A typical student might say this more succinctly, "We got to get to class with our head on straight." I think that is basic education.

I am not an educational theorist, but I believe in education the closeness of students to a good man or woman is the best we can offer our children. When our children get the very best and the school again becomes a community of scholars some amazing things happen. The incidences of disruptive behavior and alcohol and drug abuse decline dramatically. As an example of the effectiveness of the program I would like to cite a few examples from around the country.

5.

According to the records from the Fort Worth Independent School District in Texas, the school teams operating within that district have succeeded in reducing drug and alcohol related referrals by 25% since participating in the school team approach training.

In the Rochester City School District in New York, at Franklin High School there has been a 32% decrease in referrals for drug/alcohol incidents. In the graduating class of 1981, 23 were in danger of not graduating. Through the efforts of the school team 18 of those 23 students will definitely graduate. Prior to the teams' work, 13 students were referred for vandalism. Following training there was no repetition from these students, resulting in a 100% improvement in this group.

In Chicago's Dunbar High School, prior to training suspensions were reported at 300 per year. Following training and the work of the school team in 1978-79 only 27 students were suspended and in 1980 the number of suspensions was down to five.

The Racine, Wisconsin Cluster reported an observable 50% decrease in disruptive behavior as manifested by a drop in discipline referrals. The prevention program implemented by the team reflected an effort which covered kindergarten through 12th grade, impacting the total school population.

6.

Jean Farb Middle School in San Diego, California reduced its number of discipline referrals considerably. According to school records, the number of referrals is down 15% from that of the previous school year. School principal, Bill McLain, attributes this reduction to the alternative activities Farb's Project Prevent Team has implemented for the students and teachers. Following their training, Farb Middle School has succeeded in obtaining a lower suspension rate than other schools located in the same area. While other comparable middle schools reported 126 and 305 suspensions there were only five from the Farb Middle School for the same time period.

At Madrone Intermediate School in Sunnyvale, California, the school team program requires teacher, parent, and student participation and focuses heavily on student attendance. It has resulted in the following actual reductions:

	Absences	
Month	79-80	80-81
1	187	30
2	142	40
3	43	13
4	23	2

At the end of the 1979-80 school year, Covington Junior High in Vancouver, Washington had a 20% reduction from the previous year in vandalism costs. The school cluster coordinator has reported that the number of students being

suspended has also decreased by approximately 15% since the team has been functioning in the school.

At Cascade Junior High School in Vancouver, Washington the in-school suspension program instituted by the team after their training experience resulted in a 600% reduction in the suspension rate from school.

South Shore Middle School in Seattle, Washington has been experiencing 70% reductions in both suspensions and expulsions since the beginning of the 1980-81 school year as a direct result of team activities.

At Lafayette High School in Lafayette, Louisiana, discipline referrals have decreased 53% and drug and alcohol offenses on campus have decreased a remarkable 80%.

Jordan Intermediate School in Salt Lake City has experienced a 95% decrease in drug and alcohol offenses on campus, a 98% drop in vandalism, 75% drop in truancy, a 90% decrease in drop-outs, a 50% drop in discipline referrals, and a 95% drop in criminal arrests.

At Clayton Intermediate School in Salt Lake City, dropouts have been eliminated completely, having been replaced by alternative placements. Suspensions have decreased by 35% and truancy has shown a 50% drop. Alcohol and drug offenses on campus and criminal arrests have become too infrequent to maintain figures on them.

8.

Adams High School in Portland, Oregon has shown definite reductions in the number of suspensions at the school as a result of their peer program.

Offense	Years	Number of Suspensions
Alcohol	77-78	9
	78-79	0
Truancy	77-78	175
	78-79	33

These sample successes in participating schools need to be placed in some perspective. There are approximately 87,000 public schools in the United States. Our efforts have been beamed at the secondary schools and their feeder schools. Since 1974, with our limited funding level, we have been able to impact approximately 2500 schools directly and about three times that number indirectly. Teams and clusters of teams have expanded the training to include, as in the case of Dallas and Salt Lake City, every school within their large metropolitan districts.

As you know, in Fiscal Year 1980, the national appropriation for this effort was down to three million dollars, from a high in 1972 of $5,407,000. Each year we have found ourselves at the regional centers implementing larger scopes of work with less resources. Certainly if cutting the rate of growth in federal spending is a goal of this administration, we are nine year veterans of the cause. This program has succeeded because it has developed models of cost effectiveness that would brighten the spirit of every auditor.

I hope that your questions regarding this program do not stop at the issue of effectiveness, but continue on to ask how such a vital program can afford to be funded at a level slightly above Metric Education and slightly lower than Consumer Education. We may be inconvenienced at times by forgetting the conversion from gallons to liters, but I have yet to see a student die from such a lack of knowledge. In every region of our country within this school year, students have commited suicide, students have been assaulted and a few murdered, and students have lost their lives in alcohol and drug related incidents. In my personal appearances before PTA's and other school groups, I have yet to meet a parent desperately suffering about law related education, or career education incentives. Parents' chief concern, borne out in every national poll, is drug abuse and discipline in our schools. I think it is time for us to put our educational funding priorities in order. In three years at a modest funding level of ten million dollars, this program could reach the 16,000 school districts in the United States. This is an attainable goal at an extremely modest cost. At a three million dollar annual appropriation it will take us over ten years, and if this program is consolidated and sent to the states in a Bloc grant, it will never happen.

In this day and age when very little seems to function efficiently and effectively, we should all be incensed

that anyone would recommend tampering with something that works. It violates a very important rule of thumb and underlying profundity, "if a system is working, leave it alone." This would be reason enough for me to leave something alone, but if additional justification is required, here are some more facts to consider;

- The Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education program has never been a part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. It has had its own legislation since 1970. The most recent amendments (P.L. 95-336) mandated a separate Office of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education within the (then) Office of Education.
- The Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program is not, like the standard discretionary program, a grants program. It provides training and technical assistance to local school districts across the nation to design and implement local programs; to build local training capacity; and to develop state and regional support networks.
- For the relatively small appropriation of three million dollars, this program is currently working with 450 schools in 36 states, Guam, and Puerto Rico. The same three million dollars, divided by the 50 states and territories would scatter the resources, dissipate the impact, and result in a piecemeal approach to the problems with no opportunity for sharing successes across the nation.

If President Reagan is correct and an entire generation of our youth is at stake, is this the time to think of including monies for the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program in a Bloc grant to the states? The word consolidation is used in reference to funds under this concept and I think it is a more acceptable term than "killing" although the result is the same. We are speaking of the possible demise of a national school program that has been operating since 1974 and is overwhelmingly popular with local school districts across the nation. Do we have the luxury of more time and money to launch another nationwide campaign when the data clearly indicate there is an effective national program already functioning? All the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program has lacked for the past nine years is administrative support and the legislative will to make this effort a high national priority.

My colleagues and I have tried faithfully to adhere to the provisions of the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Act. Give us the renewed legislation and a new national priority and we can finish this work through the local school districts of the nation. I seek a new beginning with our priorities and rhetoric in line. I want, on behalf of the regional training centers, the school teams, local educators, and our nation's children, the greatest reward for doing this job well -- the opportunity to do more.

Mr. KAZEN. I would like to ask Walter, if he will, to summarize some of the things, and then be available for whatever questions you have.

Senator HUMPHREY. All right, thank you, Mr. Kazen.

Mr. HOLLINS. My name is Walter Hollins, I am currently director of training for the region VII training center. I would also like to mention that I was trained by the region VII training center under the "Help communities help themselves" approach in 1972, I have served as a consultant to the center, traveling about the region working with schools and teams, and in 1976 I joined the staff full time. I am one of those people who Dr. Nowlis mentioned who spends about 20 days a month in the field.

Before I discuss some of the programs that have been developed by teams in the region, I would like to share from my own personal life an anecdote that is appropriate in looking at a flow of how the drug and alcohol abuse issues became so large in America.

The neighborhood I grew up in existed in Shreveport, La.; we lived in the middle of the block. On the end of the block, there was an elderly woman in her late seventies, who we affectionately called "Miss Mary." Whenever my peer group would get together, a group of guys, we would at times throw rocks at street lamps. Miss Mary would observe this behavior, call us over and get a switch off a peach tree in her yard, ask us to come up on the porch, and she would switch us, really whip us, because it was wrong to throw rocks at street lamps—or whenever we did anything out of place on that particular block, Miss Mary was always there, observing and watching. And correcting behavior. It was double jeopardy punishment, because she would always call home to my mother or my father, and I would get another whipping when I got home.

What happened, though, was that Miss Mary died, and I think a lot of other Miss Mary's around the country died, so the incommunity policing that Miss Mary and Mr. Williams and a lot of other people like them no longer exists. Kids from my generation had positive role models—guardians of community values. The generations that came later no longer had that incommunity policing or community role models. With very few saying to kids "don't do that, it's wrong," drugs got big, and in the sixties, there was an epidemic, and in the midseventies, it became a greater epidemic, and what I see happening now is that because of a lack of Miss Mary's serving as intervention agents and as prevention agents, communities are losing the battle with drugs from the prevention and intervention side. We still need Miss Mary's or some prevention element.

I think now that from a national viewpoint, prevention should be central. I heard your figure of $60 some odd billion. During the Senate Banking Committee hearing last June, Treasury agents gave testimony that said over $100 billion in profit was made through the sale of illicit drugs and substances; $100 billion, sir, is a lot of money. And if we as a Nation cannot afford $2 or $3 million for a Federal effort to intervene from a prevention standpoint in drug and substance abuse issues, we are going to be back in the sixties, where LSD was commonplace, marihuana was socially acceptable, and pills were consumed like aspirin.

I think through this training program (ADAP) a lot of programs in school districts have been developed. I would like to take a little time, to highlight region VII specifically, and cite some of the programs that have surfaced that not only relate to drugs and alcohol, but also relate to issues of school climate, issues of discipline, issues of self-esteem of students, issues of faculties working together; because if we are going to view drugs as people-related problems, then I think a lot of people program spinoffs have occurred as a result of programs that have been developed by the trained teams that have gone back to work within their communities and schools.

Beginning with Arizona—and I did not bring a lot of statistical information, but I brought programmatic information, because I think a hallmark of the school team approach is what type of programs have school-based teams developed that are serving the schools and serving the communities. I think that it is central to focus on programs. As numbers can be misleading and manipulated to serve self sustaining purposes. However, when programs do not work in school systems, there is normally a tendency to disband those programs, in lieu of more successful approaches. Most of the programs I will discuss have been in operation for 2 or more years.

In Phoenix, Ariz., the Opportunity Hall concept was established throughout that school system, where rather than expel students within the Phoenix Union High School district for disruptive behavior, for drug and alcohol abuse, or whatever type of inappropriate behavior, they would place them in the Opportunity Hall program. The Opportunity Hall concept is embodied in the statement that the program gives the student an opportunity to review behavior, to shift and to change behavior, so that they (students) will not lose the educational services that are being provided. This particular program has been in place for the last 4 years. I think the program can demonstrate that there has been a reduction in the amount of suspensions and expulsions within the Phoenix Union High School district.

The Phoenix Union High School district is also in the process of developing an employee assistance program. I would like to note where the idea initially came from. The Fort Worth independent school district had in place an employee assistance program and through networking efforts in the region, members of the Phoenix cluster talked to members of the Fort Worth cluster about how to go about setting up that particular approach—EPA—the school board in Phoenix has now accepted the idea and are in the process of putting that particular program in the school district.

There is a program of personal and professional growth which meets every Wednesday in Phoenix. It is a program that is designed not only to help employees professionally to deal with drugs and alcohol issues within schools, but it also deals with discipline and new discipline models. It is a voluntary program, which meets from 6:30 to 9:30; 30 to 40 teachers are going on their own to get updated information as to what new models, concepts, etc., are available, to aid students as well as aid themselves.

In Little Rock, Ark., there are over 20 trained trainers from the trainer concept which Dr. Nowlis mentioned. These 20 trainers in Little Rock, Ark., during the 1978-79 school term delivered over

1,000 hours of staff development and inservice sessions to school district personnel.

Central High School—and most of us in America are familiar with Central High School because it received a lot of notoriety back in 1955, 1956, 1957—Central High School developed a program 3 years ago entitled "TAILS, Tigers Are Always Interested in Listening to Students." This is a program that helps to bridge gaps between the faculty members and the students on Central's campus. It is a program that has helped to allow students an opportunity to air some of their complaints and to have faculty members there present, to listen to the complaints and to attempt to mediate dually those issues that the students raise. The TAILS program has been effective, and it is one of the centerpieces that the teams have gone back and established.

Henderson Junior High School in Little Rock, Ark., has developed a referral for counseling program. This is where problem students are identified early before treatment or intervention is needed, and are referred for counseling.

In the referral for counseling program that Henderson set up, there is a specific person who has gone through training and listens to the problems of kids, one on one. So it is sort of a deviation from the traditional counseling approach. This is a person who has been designated by the school who is available to listen to problems that kids have so they will not be suspended or expelled from school.

The former cluster coordinator of the Little Rock cluster, who is now with the School of Social Work at the University of Arkansas, Little Rock campus, has developed a Mid-South Summer School Annual Conference where people throughout the State of Arkansas come to get updated information on drugs, alcohol, and programs that are successful within the region. This was a spinoff out of the cluster school team approach, where this person left and took a position with the faculty (U.A.L.R.),[1] but continued efforts to attempt to help others deal with drug and alcohol issues that were happening in their local communities.

Finally from Little Rock, there is the Club 70 of Parkview High School. Club 70 is a student intervention effort, where students have formed intervention teams and are working directly with cliques that exist on the campus. Most school campuses have student cliques. Specifically from the region I am representing, there are cowboy cliques, doper cliques, jock cliques or athlete cliques, bookworm cliques, cheerleader cliques, et cetera. What the Club 70 does at Parkview High School is try to intervene and mediate issues that exist between these cliques, it has been a successful approach, because it is the students who initiated this effort. They formed several student teams at Parkview to go about solving problems and help students who would not work with adults.

Woodland Park, Colo., which was recently trained during the 1979 fiscal year, developed a program called DARE TO CARE.[2] This is a program that directly involves parents within the Woodland Park community, but the program was set up on the school

[1] UALR: University of Arkansas at Little Rock.

[2] D.A.R.E. TO C.A.R.E.: Drugs and alcohol require responsive education; change always requires education.

campus. After hours, parents can come by and talk to groups of teachers and groups of students about problems that exist and plan how they can impact these particular problems.

In Wichita, Kans., the Wichita public school system has established a school liaison police program where police officers have been trained in transactional analysis, and other approaches to learn how to communicate with kids effectively rather than using the traditional cop-student approach, how to use some psychosocial models in order to impact some of the problems that kids have, and how to offer drug and alcohol information in a nonthreatening manner. This program has been in existence for about 3 years, and in talking to the police officers who are part of it, they have learned a lot about students that they probably would not have learned. Students have learned that "cops" can be friends and helpers.

I have a whole list, but I will offer a few more as others are waiting to testify. In Dallas, there is a cadre of over 100 trainers. Dallas at one point had been the centerpiece of the school-team approach for the Nation, in terms of what can happen when teams return home and develop other teams. There is a cadre of over 100 trained trainers in Dallas who are doing weekend retreats almost every weekend throughout a school year. The same exists in Salt Lake City, where there is a cadre of over 30 trained trainers and every weekend their calendar is full, where there might be two or three weekend retreats of school faculties learning the school-team approach of how to solve problems.

In Fort Worth, Tex.—and there is a person representing Fort Worth here, so I will not say a whole lot about Fort Worth—but there, too, exists a cadre of trained trainers who periodically will do weekend retreats, student training, et cetera.

So there is a lot in terms of programs that have been developed that schools have bought into, and the schools are saying, "These are some of the programs that are working."

Senator HUMPHREY. Mr. Hollins, I am going to have to ask you to kind of abbreviate it, because there are other people, and I do not want to cut them short. I am not shutting you off, by any means, if you would just wind it up for now.

Mr. HOLLINS. I will just stop with these programs, because others are in my written testimony; there are about four pages of programs. But I do want to offer some of the assumptions used during the training. One is, we assume that local people solve local problems best.

What we provide are some skills and some resources and technical assistance and followup to augment whatever skills school teams receive during training, so that they can go back and put the local people solve local problems best concept into operation. Local people solve local problems best.

Another assumption that we use is that people do not fail, plans do, the centerpiece of our training is the creative problem-solving process which we call the action plan. And it is a process. It is not as much product-oriented as it is process-oriented. And when these school teams leave training, they leave with a product, but they also leave with a process, so that when they go back home, if the initial plan fails, they operate out of that assumption of people do

82-644 O - 81 - 3

not fail, plans do. They go back to the drawing board and they continue to use the planning process until an effective solution is developed.

And I think an interesting assumption that we operate from, working with school-based teams is this one: people take ownership in things they help create. So it is not that we are solving problems for school districts or for local schools; they are creating their own solutions programs, strategies, et cetera, to impact their own problems.

So those are three of the basic assumptions that we operate with and try to get school teams to utilize once they return home. Then we merely provide the technical assistance and other followup services that are needed in an ancillary way, to augment whatever school teams are about.

I did want to mention one other thing, sir. It is rather important to me. I alluded to the type of neighborhood I grew up in where Miss Mary existed. It was also a neighborhood that was a dumping ground for dope. I think a lot of communities exist in America in which minorities live that have become dumping grounds for dope and other illicit substances. Not that I can represent all minority viewpoints; I can merely represent my own. But over the years, I have seen this program work in terms of fostering better relations on school campuses and on school faculties between members who would identify with a minority group and members who would identify with other groups. The program fosters communications, it fosters the development of self-concept. If you seriously think about it, what does a kid have to look forward to who is coming from an area of blight, who is coming from a barrio, who is coming from a slum? What does a child like that have to look forward to? What does a child like that have in terms of heroes or images to look up to? In a lot of communities, the pusher drives the big car and has the pocketful of money, and he becomes a hero. And there are kids who want to be like that.

What this program has offered, considering the enemy that exists, is it gives a child skills, self-concept development. How can I develop my own self-concept, how can I find alternative heroes. It gives the child the ability to solve problems, interpersonal problems, problems related to school, school issues, living issues, et cetera. I think this is something that has not been a part of the traditional curriculum. The basics, the three R's are essential. But I think in today's complex society, we need to address the issues of what skills do we need to impart to students so that they can live in this complex society that we have created, because we are not doing anything to detour $100 billion in profit by whoever is making that particular amount of money, and we need to be about the business of getting kids skills so that they will have the ability to say no to drugs, to say no to alcohol, to say no to low self-concept, et cetera.

I think I have taken up too much time, here.

Senator HUMPHREY. What makes you say that? You are enthusiastic.

Mr. HOLLINS. Well, yes, I am definitely that. I wish I could go on and on all day and cite the merits of this program, but in summation, I think it should be a national effort——.

Senator HUMPHREY. I am really going to have to stop you here and ask some questions, so we can get to our other panels.

Mr. HOLLINS. All right.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Hollins follows:]

TESTIMONY
BEFORE THE
SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE
ON
ALCOHOLISM AND DRUG ABUSE

April 6, 1981

Washington, D.C.

Testimony of:

Walter H. Hollins
Director of Training

USDE Region VII Training Center
San Antonio, Texas

Mr. Chairman and Honorable Senators of the United States Senate Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse. Thank you for this opportunity to testify and to offer some of my experiences and observations concerning the effectiveness of the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program. My hope today, due to the seriousness of the decision before you, is that the information I offer will in some way aid you in determining a means of funding which will continue what I and many others consider to be one of the most cost effective and programmatically effective programs devised and developed by the federal government.

My name is Walter Howard Hollins and I am currently serving as Director of Training for the U.S. Department of Education's Region VII Training Center under the auspices of the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program. Since 1973 I have been affiliated with the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program in three different capacities. First, I was part of a community based team which went through the early years of training provided by the Region VII Center. The theme of the training during those years was "Help Communities Help Themselves", thus I am capable of offering information from the perspective of a recipient of the training. Secondly, I served as a consultant to the Region VII Center, providing technical assistance to trained community and school-based teams in the ten state

region, thus I am capable of offering a perspective about the effectiveness of the program as an "outsider looking in" and finally, since 1976 I have been a full-time staff member serving as a Trainer/Facilitator, Director of New Programs, and now as Director of Training, thus I am capable of offering information from the viewpoint of a professional helper working directly within the system. As requested by Senator Gordon J. Humphrey, Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse, I will limit my comments in this text to two main areas of concern. First, comments on the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program from the perspective of a trainer, and secondly, comments concerning the development of the program and the evolution of the school team approach.

Before I begin offering comments concerning the training aspect of the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program, I would like to include as part of my testimony a letter I recently received from the Oklahoma City Public Schools, (I think the letter will address some aspects of training).

Oklahoma City Public Schools
900 North Klein
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73106

DIRECTOR OF MIDDLE SCHOOLS
AND FIFTH GRADE CENTERS

March 24, 1981

Mr. Walter Hollins
Center of Education Development, Inc.
6800 Park Ten Blvd.
Suite 273 South
San Antonio, Texas 78213

Dear Walter:

It is often said that you should "Make this a better and a more beautiful world because you have lived in it." Oklahoma City is a better place because of your recent visit here.

The approximately forty principals, assistant principals, guidance counselors, classroom teachers and members of the staff of the superintendent have asked me to convey their gratitude for your having brought the "school team process for change" workshop to our city, and to express their appreciation for the value received from it.

It was universally expressed by these educators that the character of the workshop represented a method of fulfilling a need in our schools, its format was logical and easily understood. But it was your presentation that represented the difference between its being just another needed workshop, and a workshop in which participation was primarily a pleasure, and secondarily an educational benefit. Your knowledge of your subject was thorough and it was obvious that you have great confidence that schools using the process can achieve success in educational problems resolution.

Several of the schools have formed school teams, applied the process and developed a product. That is a start. The long range results are yet to be determined but the future is promising.

On behalf of the participants of the workshop, please accept my thanks and further, let us extend an invitation to you to return to Oklahoma City at any time. You will be most welcome.

Sincerely,

The Middle School Teachers,
Counselors, and Administrators
of the Oklahoma City Public
School System

VLH:jr

3.

The text of the Oklahoma City letter says a lot about the reception of the training from local people. The focal point or central focus of the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program has been training. Training that would aid in the development of school based people in the following areas:

- problem solving skills
- communication skills
- program development skills such as planning, community organization, fundraising, and effective management
- skills in observing and facilitating group process and interpersonal interaction
- development of program models such as peer counseling, parent effectiveness training, peer resource programs, and examples of coordinated school and community activities implemented by teams that have already developed effective programs after being trained by the regional center
- skills related to the development of effective drug and alcohol programs
- skills that would lead to the development of classroom and school discipline models

4.

Besides the skill emphasis on training, four key assumptions are used:

1. People take ownership in things they help create
2. Those who want to, do.
3. People do not fail, plans do.
4. Local people solve local problems best.

Thus, the training provided by the Region VII Center is geared toward the development and training of school based teams of seven members each. School districts send four teams to training forming a cluster of teams. Four teams with seven members each and one overall coordinator which equals the school team/cluster approach. The assumptions apply accordingly -- the seven member teams during training develop plans of action to impact problems back home, (people take ownership in things they help create and local people solve local problems best). But the plans of action are more process related than product related. Therefore, the intent of training is to have the teams return home with processes whereby if one solution, or program or strategy fails, they can plan again using the action planning process, (people do not fail, plans do) hence the effort aimed at solving problems is interactive and proactive.

With four teams from each school district, rather than one team, a support system is built into the effort. As well a greater chance of district-wide impact exists because of the numbers of people trained.

5.

The training provided by the center is unique, cost effective, and it works but more importantly, the center staffs do not attempt to solve problems for local people, but offer a problem solving process, "local people solve local problems best" especially when they are skilled in certain processes.

The components of the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program effort can be summed up as follows,

- Development of an action plan by school based teams
- Direct experience in the acquisition of new skills fostered by the "laboratory model" of training, whereby the new skill can be tried in a relatively safe, isolated environment prior to a return to the back home setting
- Intensive role modeling on the part of the center staff and consultants. Highly skilled professionals who have acquired skills on the front lines, in most cases, over six to eight years of work.
- A balance of skill development and personal growth. Many of the skills aimed at professional growth and problem solving can be used to enhance personal growth.

Through the training provided by the Region VII Center many successful local programs have evolved, I would like to conclude this section of my test by citing a few of the successes from Region VII:

6.

Arizona -- Phoenix Union High School District

1. Established a revised Opportunity Hall program designed as an alternative to suspensions and expulsions of students. Program also offers decision making and problem solving concepts to students.
2. The Phoenix Union High School District has developed an employee assistance program designed to provide services to impaired employees within the district.
3. A professional growth program has been designed and implemented to enhance the skills of employees within the district in addressing problems related to discipline and substances.

Arkansas -- Little Rock Public Schools

1. Has trained and developed a cadre of over 20 trainers who conduct personal and professional growth workshops. During the 1979-80 school year this cadre of trainers conducted over 100 staff development sessions.
2. Central High School's TAILS program (Tigers Always Interested in Listening to Students) of peer counseling, designed to foster student-student dialogue and teacher-student dialogue.
3. Henderson Junior High School's RFC Program (referral for counseling) designed as an alternative classroom program.
4. Club 70 of Parkview High School (a student intervention geared toward solving problems on campus).

7.

Colorado -- Woodland Park School District

1. Has initiated the process of establishing a student coordinating committee which will develop solutions to student related problems on the high school campus.
2. Dare to Care Program (Drugs and Alcohol Through Responsive Education and Change Always Requires Education) a community problem solving effort.

Kansas -- Wichita Public Schools

1. Has established a school-police liaison program where Wichita police officers are working directly with students covering counseling, awareness of the law, decision making, etc.

Louisiana -- Lafayette Parish School Board

1. The Cluster has developed an outstanding positive discipline program which is being extended beyond the high school into all the elementary schools in the parish system. The program was initiated at Carencro High School.
2. Comeaux High School's TALK Program (Teachers Available to Listen to Kinds) designed to open up dialogue between students and teachers.
3. The Involvement Center, a parish-wide program geared to youth. Focusing on student problems.

8.

Louisiana -- Orleans Parish School Board, Carver Complex

1. Has developed a program with a training and workshop emphasis designed to expand the school team approach to its feeder schools.
2. Edwards Elementary has developed a program entitled "Teach a Brother, Teach a Sister". The program is designed to provide role models for elementary children.

Oklahoma -- Tulsa County Superintendent of Schools

1. Has developed a program called Street School, primarily designed for students with drug related and behavior problems.
2. Has developed Tulsa County Alternative School, an alternative program designed to continue the educational process of students suspended or expelled for drugs or behavior infractions at the high school level.
3. Tulsa Public School Drug Committee, a committee composed of parents and educators who plan and recommend programs related to substance abuse.

Texas -- Dallas Independent School District

1. An in-district training program composed of a cadre of nearly 100 teachers, counselors, and support personnel, providing thousands of hours of staff development time designed around problems pertinent to youth.
2. The establishment of the Office of Discipline and Student Services designed to promote alternative and optional approaches for troublesome youth.

3. A cooperative school program sponsored by the Dallas County Juvenile Department, Dallas Junior League, and Dallas Independent School District.
4. Development of a citizenship curriculum. A curriculum designed to address self-responsibility and self-discipline.
5. A peer alcohol and drug education program, utilizing about 300 high school students who work with students in the middle school system.

Texas -- Fort Worth Independent School District

1. An on-going School Board Task Force on alcohol and drug concerns.
2. An employee assistance program.
3. A student peer-alcohol education program.
4. An evening training program for parents of the school district, which is designed to help parents become preventers of drug abuse in the family unit.
5. Established a drug abuse prevention program in the alternative schools for suspended students. The program has a full-time drug abuse prevention specialist.
6. An in-district training program with a cadre of 50 trainers who train other district staff in the school-team approach.

Texas -- Houston Independent School District

1. Appropriated funds at the local level to continue the crime prevention and drug education program when the State of Texas discontinued funding.

2. The Burbank Junior High School team, working in conjunction with the University of Houston's Teacher Corps Project has established a model school climate approach.

Texas -- Northside Independent School District, San Antonio

1. Has developed a resource library with information on drug and alcohol abuse, discipline, personal and professional growth.
2. Has the N.O.C. Program (Northside Opportunities Center), designed as an alternative to suspension and expulsion.
3. Has developed a media approach entitled "Learning for Life" which appears on Cable Channel 11 weekly.

Utah -- Salt Lake City School District

1. A trained cadre of more than 20 trainers who conduct staff developments, in-services, and weekend retreats for the school districts.
2. K-12 Alcohol and Drug Education Program, "Here's Looking at You", designed to provide information and alternatives to youth in the school district.

Gentlemen, the program works, the school districts prove that, the local people support the effort; if the categorical grant funding for the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program is discontinued one of the most successful programs in America will die a cruel and unusual death, it will die because as a program it works and is cost effective.

11.

The school team/cluster approach has evolved over a period of time and has been measured and tested against other approaches attesting to the effectiveness of the effort.

In 1972 the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education effort worked under the title "Help Communities Help Themselves". Under this concept, seven-member community based teams were trained to return to their local communities with a plan of action to impact drug and alcohol related problems. The seven-member teams were composed of various community elements, parents, youth, civic leaders, law enforcement personnel, professionals, etc. The "Help Communities Help Themselves" effort proved to be effective in quite a few cases, but the thinking was that there had to be a more cost effective, more efficient way of making more of an impact. The logical questions were asked,

- where is the heart of the drug and alcohol problem?
- where will a community's future be impacted most?
- where is the central rallying point of communities?

The answer was logical, the schools. The local school systems would be a much better avenue and provide an existing vehicle for addressing drug and alcohol issues.

Though the community approach was beneficial, the initial thought was that by training school based teams the impact would be greater (it has proven to be). Therefore, in 1974 the training focus shifted from community based teams, composed of members representing different viewpoints to school-based teams consisting primarily of school representatives.

The rationale for the shift in focus is embodied in several assumptions:

- A prevention oriented program works best in an instructional environment.
- Current information and hard data reflect that youth are central to the issues of drug and substance abuse.
- Schools are a microcosm of the total community -- impact schools and the community in turn is impacted.
- By working with and through schools the future of America could be better impacted by providing a by-product (students) capable of making decisions and solving complex problems (social).

The School Team Approach has been operative since 1974 and has served to be the most effective prevention model designed to this point. Has the "school-team" approach proven effective? My response to the question is a resounding and emphatic yes!

82-644 O - 81 - 4

13.

The approach has produced the following results:

- trained school-based teams capable of developing action plans to impact drug and alcohol and crime/discipline issues on school campuses.
- development of prevention oriented drug education curriculums.
- development of program models geared toward students and parents (cross-age tutoring, peer counseling, parent training, P.T.O. training, etc.)
- skills to assess school drug and alcohol problems. Skills possessed by teachers, students, and administrators.
- trained student teams capable of training other students and developing plans of action to impact school or community related problems.
- team members with skills in planning and implementing solutions, programs, strategies, and activities which are prevention oriented.
- trained cadres of school-based trainers capable of training others in useful approaches, skill development, and action planning.
- a plethora of programs has been developed geared toward problem solving, decision making and self-concept.
- a proactive planning system capable of addressing issues besides those of drug or alcohol abuse.

From my viewpoint the effectiveness of the School Team Approach can be demonstrated in another area besides results. The fact that the approach has evolved over a period of time

through a trial and error process utilizing logical conclusions. The results are hand in glove with the process, a logical evolutionary process, which has been tested and evaluated. Because of the Nature of the process itself, results will be seen in schools and communities for years to come.

I would like to offer one final point of information concerning the evolution and development of the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program, from Publication NO E 80-3800 U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 1980 Department of Education booklet entitled "The School Team Approach" comes the outline of the chronological development of the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program.

15.

FIGURE 1

YEAR		BUDGET	PROGRAM NAME
FY 72		$5,407,035	HELP COMMUNITIES HELP THEMSELVES
FY 73		$6,513,629	HELP COMMUNITIES HELP THEMSELVES
FY 74		$5,838,589	HELP COMMUNITIES HELP THEMSELVES
			SCHOOL TEAM PREVENTION AND EARLY INTERVENTION PROGRAM
FY 75		$3,446,899	SCHOOL TEAM PREVENTION AND EARLY INTERVENTION PROGRAM
FY 76	USOE	$1,625,000	SCHOOL TEAM APPROACH FOR PREVENTING AND REDUCING ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE AND OTHER DESTRUCTIVE BEHAVIOR
	LEAA	$1,112,000	SCHOOL TEAM APPROACH FOR PREVENTING AND REDUCING CRIME AND DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIOR
FY 77	USOE	$1,840,000	SCHOOL TEAM CLUSTER APPROACH FOR PREVENTING AND REDUCING ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE AND OTHER DESTRUCTIVE BEHAVIOR
	LEAA	$1,726,000	SCHOOL TEAM CLUSTER APPROACH FOR PREVENTING AND REDUCING CRIME AND DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIOR
FY 78	USOE	$2,000,000	SCHOOL TEAM CLUSTER APPROACH FOR PREVENTING AND REDUCING ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE AND OTHER DESTRUCTIVE BEHAVIOR
	LEAA	$ 952,303	SCHOOL TEAM CLUSTER APPROACH FOR PREVENTING AND REDUCING CRIME AND DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIOR
FY 79		$2,000,000	SCHOOL TEAM CLUSTER APPROACH FOR PREVENTING AND REDUCING ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE AND OTHER DESTRUCTIVE BEHAVIOR
FY 80		$3,000,000	SCHOOL TEAM CLUSTER APPROACH FOR PREVENTING AND REDUCING ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE AND OTHER DESTRUCTIVE BEHAVIOR

There are two points of interest from the information.

1. Notice if you will the reduction in funding from FY 72 to FY 80 - considering inflation, etc., and taking into account that the program serves 50 states and several trust territories, the achievements are remarkable.
2. Note also that in FY 76 - FY 78, USOE and LEAA (Justice Department) worked together to impact problems using the school team approach. Two federal agencies sharing funds, staff, etc., to impact crime and disruptive behavior. In this case too, the approach proved effective.

Finally, I can say very little more about the training and evolution of the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program. It has worked and has done the job the legislation intended it to do, yet here we are again discussing the death knell of an effective program. The states do not possess the capability to continue the effort at this point in time. Allow us to continue.

In conclusion, gentlemen, I would state that my heart is heavy, as word has reached the local level that minds are made up, and that no matter what the nature of the testimony the funding for the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program will be placed in Bloc grants to the states. If that is the case I would finally offer to you these concluding comments:

The lives of our youth are precious, are gemstones to be polished - though we as adults will one day die and perish

as fading rays of sunlight to night's dark glow, our vigor and essence will ring out loud through the lives of our children and their children. The program I represent at best has prepared youth to say no to drugs and alcohol abuse, to make decisions and solve problems. These skills will be needed for the enemy we wage war against, and indeed it is war and is a formidable enemy, consider this information from War on Drugs magazine.

> "U.S. Treasury Investigators told a Senate Banking Subcommittee hearing June 5, 1980, that they had uncovered large scale laundering of drug money through Florida banks, confirming charges made in 1978 in the best selling paperback, DOPE, Inc., Britian's Opium War Against the U.S. The book, first issued in late 1978 and now about to appear in its second edition, argued that major sections of the banking system were handling $100 billion a year in dope revenues, twice the annual retail volume of all U.S. auto dealerships, and all of it in hard cash."

One hundred billion dollars, gentlemen, is a lot of cash dollars. If indeed the figures are correct, the enemy is great and need not worry about inflation of Bloc grants. The enemy is prepared and is willing to spend money to make money and enslave our youth, your children and mine, to drugs. Yet we as a nation are willing to say that we cannot muster up two million dollars to continue a prevention

oriented program. If the training effort is not continued as is and is lumped in with metric education, sex education, handicapped education, etc., in Bloc grants to states, we return to the sixties. The sixties, gentlemen, when drugs flowed in the streets of America like water, the sixties when LSD was O.K., when marijuana was socially acceptable, when pills were commonplace.

The November, 1980 issue of Reader's Digest reports the following,

> "The latest (1979) National High School Senior Survey shows that not only does one out of ten 12th graders smoke pot daily, but these daily users now average 3½ joints a day, and 13 percent of them smoke more than seven joints daily. of the 51 percent who smoked pot at all during their senior year, 43 percent said they usually stay high three to six hours or more."

If we cannot stop the supply, let us at least give the youth the skills to solve problems and to say no to drugs, decision making.

A war is raging in America, a war of drugs and alcohol, a war waged with dollars (billions from the side of the enemy). A war that takes as hostage the lives of our children, a war that takes as casualties the families of America, a war that the enemy is winning. All politics aside, gentlemen

19.

of this esteemed Senate, my children are at stake and for those of you who have children, yours are at stake. We face a 100 billion dollar a year enemy and I hear us say as a nation that we are not up to the task of continuing a national prevention program. As a combat-tested program I urge you to carefully consider your decision and let us face this menace head on, let us not retreat in the face of a 100 billion dollar foe. Let us strive to maintain this national focus on prevention. To me our children and our future matter. May God guide you well.

Thank you!

Senator HUMPHREY. What is the name of the entity you represent? Is it affiliated with the university there?

Mr. KAZEN. The name of the institute? It is a nonprofit corporation called the Center for Educational Development, and the original home was Trinity University in San Antonio.

Senator HUMPHREY. I see. How much money was your contract with Washington for this year?

Mr. KAZEN. We got a little bit over $500,000 to do training, and 580 days of technical assistance. Most of the money comes through us to the teams themselves. We have a staff of six people that covers 10 States, to give you some idea of what we are talking about.

Senator HUMPHREY. Five hundred thousand?

Mr. KAZEN. It is a little bit over, I think. I do not have the exact figure.

Senator HUMPHREY. Does that represent all of your funding, or do you get funding from elsewhere?

Mr. KAZEN. Yes, sir, that represents our funding.

Senator HUMPHREY. How many people are involved?

Mr. KAZEN. There are six full-time staff members. When you talk about a regional training center, it is represented by a small core group, of which we would be two of the core staff members, and then there are people who have gone through the program who have become trainers, who are consultants to us, but they have full-time jobs—they are principals, they are superintendents, they are counselors—and we are able to pick up these people and mass them at any particular point. There are three support staff people and three professionals and these consultants who cover those 10 States—and again, when we are talking about cost-effectiveness, if you were going to duplicate that by States, you would need at least five people per State, and we cover 10 States—you would need 50 people to do the job that the six of us are doing right now.

Senator HUMPHREY. In practical terms, what do you do? What happens when people come to your center, and what happens when you go out to provide technical assistance?

Mr. KAZEN. Well, it is divided into two parts. We do training of the teams that are eligible for funding. This year, we will probably get about 200 applications in, of which we can only fund four. So we are talking not necessarily about competitive funding, as much as sweepstakes. You know, they have got as much chance of getting a grant as they do winning a magazine sweepstakes. And yet, they keep coming in and saying, "We need. . . ." So we are talking about terrible funding levels.

But we will go into training with the four clusters, each one bringing four schools with it. There will be 23 people in each cluster. And for 10 days in October or November, depending on the funding, we will have an intensive experience where, for 10 days and nights, from 7 in the morning until 10 at night, we will go through the process that Walter was describing, of developing a team and giving them a process to develop a plan of action and the skills and the will to go back and do the work. Starting as soon as they reach home, we will follow up each one of those teams, of which there are four to a cluster, with five visits for each school, although those are minimums and not maximums. We have been to some school districts 30 and 40 times in the school year. So that we will then follow them up after their training. They will go back home knowing more about the problem and knowing where some resources are and begin to set up their programs, and we will come right behind them.

A typical technical assistance day for us, with our limited funding—and again, I wish there were some auditors around, and we could sit down and talk about how we spread some dollars out—but we move through maybe two States in a day. We will get to Boulder and start—a typical day for me several weeks ago was starting a 7 o'clock breakfast meeting with the superintendents, the chiefs of police, and whatever. I would then move typically to a school building, meet the principal and the counselors, check on their plan of action, maybe help them do a workshop, have a luncheon with someone else, travel in the car down to Woodland Park, which is up into the mountains, go to a superintendents' board meeting that night, where there are angry parents because that day, one of the children had emptied a gun into the school. That evening, we have another session, and we begin the next day. That is typically what we do.

We get requests all day long in the center, with the support people taking the requests in for technical assistance, and we try our best to get there.

I may mention the point that at $3 million, although we are writing manuals on how you prevent burnout, which this program has certainly learned how to do that, it is questionable how long we can continue at that level with this number of people putting in those hours, and I ask you without exaggerating if anybody thinks that people can really stay gone from their own families for 23 days out of a month. We developed a program a few years ago on how to maintain our own families, because while we were out there

saving the world, our own families began to get under tremendous stress

I went out and did a workshop on how to prevent abuse of cigarette consumption in schools, and came back to find my own sons had experimented with their first cigarettes. So we are talking about some very practical things that we have to live with on a day-to-day basis, too.

Did I answer the question?

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, you did.

You made an assertion that was rather striking. You said that with $10 million you could, in a 3-year period go through 16,000 school districts, or you could pretty well blanket the country, you claim, and be through with it.

Mr. KAZEN. Yes. None of us think we are going to retire in this work, and I am ready to move on, and a lot of us are. It has been a long time, and it has been a very challenging and rewarding time. But I do not think as centers, we were ever set up to think we were going to go on forever. We do not progress at a rate—whether we have more to do or less to do or nothing to do. We thought we had an objective, and we were trying to meet it, and as soon as it is met, we will go on and do some other things. We all have other things we need to do, also.

And I was just saying that I think—and I think this figure can be backed up, if you would gather some more data on it—that with the 16,000 school districts and the testimony you are going to hear, you are going to hear schools that can tell you they do not need the help anymore. There is an initial investment with the training and technical assistance and everything that went into it, and we are talking about a major urban school district, maybe $10,000 was spent. For that much money, the school problem has got the problem solved as far as education prevention is concerned. That does not mean there are not going to be children abusing drugs and alcohol, but the school is able to deal with that, and raise their own money, and deal with it, without another dollar of Federal money coming in to do that.

I do not think there is another Federal program that can say that. If we had $10 million, instead of this sweepstakes business that we are dealing with now, we could get out there and open it up to every major district within these regions and really, we do not have to train 16,000 school districts. If we hit the major ones, the big ones can hit the little ones. In the rural areas, one grant to one rural school district has impacted five rural districts by pulling the rest of them in from the outlying areas. That is why it is so cost effective, and that is the promise of this program that very few programs can state. And I am suggesting that the difference between what the Federal Government can raise and what we really need to train on a year-round basis—our training now takes place at the beginning of the school year—we need to be training in the summer when the teachers are out of school. It is also more cost efficient, because we do not pay substitute teachers, they are not out of school buildings, and so forth. If we had that money, we could be through with this problem within 3 school years. I am talking about 27 months, if you are dealing with a school year of 9 months. Three years, 4 years, we will be way down the road, and

we will have the problem essentially licked. And that is what we are dealing with when people say, "Well, let's send it to the States." It will take the States 3 years to figure out who is going to do this program. It would take them 3 years to accumulate the staffs that are already in place, and maybe 4 years to learn what they are doing, and I am suggesting we have not got that kinds of time. Whereas, if we left the thing alone, as I put in my testimony, it seems to me in this day and age when very little works, we have got something that works; let us leave it alone, let it work, and let us see if it cannot come to a conclusion. I think we would find that it would.

Senator HUMPHREY. You are saying, then, that once you activate these units in the localities, that they are self-sustaining, that they continue, that they replace their members who are lost through retirement or whatever, so that once you get them started, they tend to keep going?

Mr. KAZEN. They certainly do, sir. They continue. Teachers move around from building to building within those school districts. But as long as the team concept is in place, we have the support of the superintendent or whoever replaces him, because superintendents are like managers and coaches in football—we bring through some districts five and six superintendents—but the concept is it is a delivery system for the decisionmakers of that district, and it is a marvelous concept, and it really does work.

Mr. HOLLINS. If I might add, sir, at this point, there is another assumption that is used, and that one is that people who want to do, do. That is what the school team approach is about, that if someone burns out and gets tired, there is someone else waiting in the wings. Sometimes, it is not even a matter of recruiting. There are people willing and waiting to join school teams, because there are a lot of doers and people who have excess energy or extra energy above and beyond the call of their regular school duties, who want to help solve problems on local school campuses. That is what makes the school team approach so attractive, that there are a lot of doers who have never had a vehicle through which to perform. We offer at some point, though, an ideal number of seven to nine members at a time, so there are people who are waiting for someone to get tired and get off school teams, so that others can get on.

Mr. KAZEN. It takes about 3 years for a team, from the time they are trained, to really mature to the point that they are self-sufficient to the extent that we are talking about. But I think you are going to be hearing some testimony this morning of people who have done that.

Senator HUMPHREY. What kind of assistance do you get from Washington? Where did the original program come from? And do all the regional centers follow the same kind of format?

Mr. KAZEN. I think you will find there is a tremendous similarity. One of the advantages of this program is that the centers get together very often. We are professionally and personally very close as a network.

We were testifying before the House, and there was a team there from Burgenfield, which we had never met. If you had heard our testimony as to the philosophy and the overview of the program

and heard them, you would have thought that they had been trained by us. That is how close the relationship is. And I think it is a tribute to Dr. Nowlis and to Miles Daugherty and to the staff at the Department of Education level that this very unique kind of relationship has been formed. It has been a very supportive teamwork from Washington down through these regional centers, to the local districts. And again, I said I have been at it for 17 years, and I have been through every kind of Federal bureaucracy. I have never seen this work in this way before.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, OK. We would like to submit a few more questions for you to answer for the record, if we may. Unfortunately, there is not time to pursue it right now.

Thank you very much. I guess you get the award for coming the longest distance.

Senator HUMPHREY. The third panel is comprised of Mr. Harold Ledford. Dr. Ledford is currently the director of Federal and State programs for the Memphis City Schools. He has worked in both Texas and Louisiana, setting up drug prevention programs and will speak to the State role in prevention programing.

Good morning, Mr. Ledford, and thank you for your patience. We are glad to have you with us today.

STATEMENT OF HAROLD LEDFORD, DIRECTOR OF FEDERAL AND STATE PROJECTS, MEMPHIS CITY SCHOOLS

Mr. LEDFORD. Thank you for allowing me to be here.

Briefly, my name is Harold Ledford. I am currently in charge of the division of Federal and State projects for the Memphis City Schools. That includes 39 different Federally-funded projects that are from both State and Federal levels.

Additionally, my office serves as the legislative liaison with the State of Tennessee and with Washington.

My interest in being here today is to talk about this particular program just for a moment. I have been a participant in a training cycle in 1972 in San Antonio, where Mr. Kazen was the director. I directed a program in the Dallas Independent School District where we were successful in placing a team in every high school, middle school, and 30 elementary schools in that area, and I received an award from President Gerald Ford for developing a model for that program while I was in Dallas.

I have served with the Texas Educational Agency in developing legislation and programs that funded drug and alcohol programs statewide.

Recently, I developed legislation in the State of Louisiana, with Senator Ned Randolph that funded these types of programs at a dollar per ADA average daily membership. That program is now being funded statewide.

I have served as a consultant to all the regional centers with the exception of Chicago. For example, I have been involved in training cycles and providing technical assistance to school districts in Oakland, Seattle, Houston, New Orleans, Atlanta, Syracuse, Memphis, and Nashville.

My involvement in this program is consistent with the philosophy that it started with with Dr. Helen Nowlis, and that is that if we train effectively school-based teams and interdisciplinary teams,

that those teams could go back to their school systems and begin to muster local support and develop programs to work with problems such as alcohol and drug addiction

I would like to express the concern regarding the inclusion of this program as a part of the consolidation or block grant program that is now currently being presented, that has been written, and I know that the Office of Management and Budget is looking at it right now. I am concerned about the structure of that consolidation and block program that if this program were put in that area that the regional centers would no longer exist.

The reason that I say that particular thing is that when we look at the number of programs that are being funded at the State level—title I, ESA, 4(c), career education, impact aid, a variety of programs—we see that the priorities of the States are looking at programs now that are bringing them not only $45,000 to $60,000, such as this program would, but bring them $4 and $5 million. And I am curious as to what their priorities might be under the block program.

When we look at how these particular programs are funded at the block level, there is some concern that this is the only program in education that works with alcohol and drugs that would be included under the education block grants. There are other alcohol and drug fundings under the health block grant, but these programs are not going to be able to be mixed at the State level, according to the Department of Education's consolidation bill. So that would make it, as I said just a moment ago, about $45,000 per State currently.

Additionally, I have a concern that has rested in this program since its beginning. It continues to be that at the local level, there needs to be support. The program has tried very hard to muster support at the local level and at the State level, and only in isolated instances have the States really picked up the support of this program. The two that I have mentioned are examples of it.

I provided a great amount of technical assistance to the school boards and to the administrations on how local systems could integrate this into their systems and support teams so that they would not burn out, which is a continuing problem.

Under the block grant, I do not feel confident that the States would be able to establish a technical assistance and training program very similar to this program that has been in existence for a long time. I very much would like to see this program continue and for it to be able to be worked out.

The regional centers that now exist serve a 7- to 12-State area with a minimum of 2 or 3 staff by using consultants in providing training and technical assistance to those chosen school systems that are involved with it. This seems to be very cost-effective with $3 million. If there were more moneys, maybe there would be some different alternatives that could be examined. But with this amount of money, I believe that a great amount of impact has been made in a cost-effective way.

I am concerned that more school districts should be intereacting with this particular program and that training and technical assistance should be able to be provided more often to the school districts and not in such a sweepstakes fashion.

This is the third time that I have testified in behalf of this program. My first was while I was in Dallas, and I asked for essentially the same thing—expanding the program because it was successful in gaining support and impacting on teachers and students in our system. The second testimony was on the statewide system in the area of prevention. And I might say that my training in San Antonio, my work in Dallas, there were a number of teams in Louisiana. And at that particular time, we were looking for a way to support those teams, and that was one of the reasons that the legislation was produced that caused that.

In the third testimony it is important to point out the same reason that I am asking for, that this program has been successful in affecting the school climate, the decrease in disruptive behaviors and the skills provided to solve the complex issues facing our schools today.

Although the research has not been consistent that this program directly reduces drugs and alcohol, it has been successful in identifying the drug problem as a people problem and working on those symptoms such as self concept, self worth and accomplishment, that school districts can effect. It is very difficult for school districts to work in many other treatment areas, because that is not their particular role.

I believe that this program should continue to be funded, but not at such a restricted level. I am concerned that the concept of this program continues and that school systems continue to get this kind of training and support. If this program is to be put under a block grant, I strongly urge that the regional centers be continued to some level to support these States in development of these types of programs and that the States might develop their own programs so that they can insure State and local support for drug and alcohol programs. I know that that might sound somewhat ambiguous, but as long as the regional centers are working directly with the locals, it will continue to be hard for the local and the State to support a program. I think it is important that the States, the regional centers, and the locals work hand-in-hand to face such a complex problem and deal with it. Not one set of programs, not one set of agendas will clearly affect it.

But let me clearly State that I would like to have the regional centers funded and the program continued, but if an alternative would provide an opportunity for the programs to expand to many more school systems and for a local and State support system, then I would suggest that the alternative be developed.

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you, Mr. Ledford.

You are the director of Federal and State programs, that means you are involved in a number of——

Mr. LEDFORD. Thirty-nine.

Senator HUMPHREY [continuing]. Various programs.—I assume you are the type of expert in State government who is trying to reach out and find funding sources where you can.

Are there any other programs like this operating in the Federal Government, available to cities, such as yours, anywhere?

Mr. LEDFORD. Not in the educational sector. Through single State agencies, through health agencies, maybe. Through local communi-

ty action, maybe, in that particular direction, but not to the extent, and not to the area that this technical assistance can provide.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, then I assume, with your duties requiring you to oversee—how many did you say, 35?

Mr. LEDFORD. Thirty-nine.

Senator HUMPHREY. Thirty-nine programs. You are not intimately acquainted with the working of this program, in fact, I guess the others who are to follow would be better to answer.

Mr. LEDFORD. Well, that particular department comes under my program, and I have worked in developing some.

Senator HUMPHREY. What would the city of Memphis do if this program is block granted?

Mr. LEDFORD. One of the things that happens under the block grant proposal is that the State will develop a State plan, under the new proposal that the local agencies will have to now go to the State for approval of their particular block, which must be considered with the State goals and priorities. If this program is put under there and the State does not pick up this particular program as a priority, then at the local level what would have to happen, the school board would have to prioritize our needs, and in this day and age when the education programs are bing cut more than any particular program in the Government presently, school districts are losing 25 to 30 percent.

In fact, in Memphis we are losing $14 million in Federal funds for our school districts next year. Dallas is losing $42 million, Los Angeles is losing $45 million. When you talk about those kinds of cuts in education programs, especially in urban areas, the number of disadvantaged handicapped, and those kinds of problems, then probably what we are looking at is that this program may or may not be funded at this level. It will be at the wishes of the school system and priority, but it will probably be related to what the budget cuts are right now.

Senator HUMPHREY. Do you feel that you would be successful in petitioning your State officials, legislators, I suppose, to use part of their educational block grant to contribute to a regional center? Do you think you would be successful in that?

Mr. LEDFORD. I think from the Federal level, in the consolidation bill, that if there were some areas that could be tied to this particular program, such as I mentioned earlier, the regional community, working with the States—the States may consider it, but I believe just the consolidation bill every 3 years, the State has to come in with the program. But there are 57 different programs under the Elementary and Secondary Act going into that consolidation. The locals only have six. The State then has 51 different programs that will be consolidated into a block area.

This program funding is essentially the same level as are education, consumer education and, considering the significance of the problem it seems such a minute effort, and I am wondering if the States would pick up a $45 million program, and what would happen with that money.

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, Mr. Ledford.

I want to preserve the balance of the time to the next panel, the people who work right at the nitty-gritty level, and I am really anxious to hear from them.

So thank you very much for coming.

The next panel is comprised of Ms. Dorothy Barrick; Mr. Joseph Kaufman, and Mr. Marvin Boyd.

Ms. Barrick was trained in the fall of 1977, and has been implementing the program since that time. Mr. Boyd is the Coordinator of Improvement of Discipline and Learning Environment in Fort Worth, Tex. He was trained at the San Antonio Center in 1976. He is a school teacher, administrator, and certified alcoholism counselor.

Mr. Joseph Kaufman is superintendent of schools in Bristol Township, Pa., and his teams were trained in the program in September of 1980.

Good morning to each of you, and thank you for your patience. Have you agreed on some order of presentation here? I do not want to offend anyone. We will go from left to right, Mr. Boyd, and again, so that we have time for questions and discussions, will you keep your opening statements as brief as possible?

STATEMENTS OF MARVIN BOYD, COORDINATOR, IMPROVEMENT OF DISCIPLINE AND LEARNING ENVIRONMENT, FORT WORTH INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT, FORT WORTH, TEX.; MS. DOROTHY BARRICK, COORDINATOR, TEACHER CENTER, NASHVILLE, TENN.; AND JOSEPH KAUFMAN, SUPERINTENDENT, BRISTOL TOWNSHIP SCHOOLS, BRISTOL, PA.

Mr. BOYD. Thank you, Senator Humphrey.

My name is Marvin Boyd. I am glad to be here. Our district was glad to do this. I am from Fort Worth, Tex. We have about 60,000 students there, and I did not decide to do this on my own. The school system thought it through and realized how serious it is for us to cut our Federal spending. So we felt this school team program was important enough that we wanted to come and tag it as a very significant thing for special considerations.

I am the head of the school teams program, and in fact, all the preventative discipline and drug programing in the school district.

Since 1976, the benefits of this program, school teams program, have been so apparent that we have employed, at our own expense, a staff of five people to do this. We have had success in many ways. For example, in one of our largest schools, in one of our poorest economic areas, we have had the highest improvement in academic achievement in our school district from the 9th grade to the 12th—it is not supposed to happen, it is supposed to happen in our schools with a high economic population, but when this program was applied, it helped academically.

A side effect of this has been that literally hundreds, thousands, in fact, of employees have gone through thousands of hours of volunteer training that was inspired through this program.

Now, I know you want some hard data on the reduction of drug abuse and I am going to give it to you. But first I am going to tell you a little bit about myself, and the things we are doing. In fact, I do not even share this with my entire school system, the personal matter I am about to share, but I think it might be important here today.

Thirteen years ago, April 1, I personally sobered up and dried out. I had been a drug addict and an alcoholic myself. I returned to

my teaching job in the schools serious because I knew it was going to be tough to survive. So I went down to the psychiatric ward and started helping other alcoholics and drug addicts. Within a year or so, I was conducting educational groups in nearly every treatment program in Fort Worth. That was before there was money for this from the Hughes bill.

Now, what I am saying to you is that I went into hospitals and clinics and psychiatric wards and by helping other chemical abusers I was trying to not only save my own life, but meanwhile trying to see what it would take to help our schools deal better with prevention and education in this area. I was, in 1 hour, in the clinical setting, dealing in a microcosm of what do you do with a person, what do you say, and what do you make happen in 1 hour that should have been happening say years before, say in education so that such tragedy would never have come to pass?

I am talking about a 150-patient-load week. Why did people have to suffer like this? When I came out of that situation, I found that what we had in drug education in the schools was simply ineffective. It was not working. So I wrote a book. I felt like Noah building his ark. No one asked me to write it.

But I wrote it. And now it is used in all of our schools, and it is adopted in one State as well as used in other schools throughout the Nation

Senator HUMPHREY. What is the name of the book?

Mr. BOYD. The name of the book is "Turning on to Better Living." It is a fifth grade book, in which we go after the problem, the temptation to use drugs in the middle schools. Also, I did some educational material for the National Institute on Alcoholism and Alcohol Abuse, but the point it seemed to me, you see, is that I am coming to this issue now from a clinical as well as educational point of view. In fact I still counsel Federal prisoners who commit crimes after they use drugs. We have plenty of those around, and I am under contract to do this. But the important thing to me here today is the school team program and its impact on school drug problems.

I think the school team program has all the qualities that we need to deal with this issue as an institutional problem. Nearly every professional who is in this area of prevention will tell you it is a family problem, a school problem, an institutional problem. This particular program allows us to take the solution where the problem is. None of us really know absolutely the cause and effect in this area, but we can get awfully close to the causes, providing that we go to where the problems really are.

The solutions are not in Washington. You have got your problems in this area, but the solutions are out there, and the trick, I think, is to go and do your solving right where the problems are. This is what the school team thing does. Actually, there is no single drug problem? There is no single solution?

But, there are drug problems, and there are solutions. These solutions are unique and what will work in one of our schools might not work in another one 6 blocks down the street. Our approach is to have the people who have the problems to solve them, because after all they are the people who will support their own solutions.

82-644 O - 81 - 5

Let me give you a few ideas of what we have done. We have established 39 school teams, and 15 student teams and, what the teams are doing is very exciting. We also have a school board task force to upgrade our prevention programing. We have a lot of community people on that, we have people from our agencies, and so on, and we meet sometimes 5 or 6 hours a week. We are planning on doing this for at least 1 year.

We are the first school system in Texas to have an employ assistance programs that helps our own people with personal problems. We say this, we want to be honest about this thing, and deal with our adult problems so that we can be good models for our own students. We are dealing with our employees' drug and alcohol problem in our schools. We tell our employees if they will emerge for help we will not punish them. We will help them. It used to be that we would let them die because they were afraid to emerge for help.

But here are some more programs: I have a person in our alternative schools, for suspended students, who is a full-time drug prevention person. And we have other educational prevention programs. Here are some of them that are working very well. In one we teach parents to be better preventers. We invite all parents in our district who have concerns about drug abuse, if mama finds the kids using drugs, she comes to our meeting, which meets every Thursday. And the program is very helpful to parents. We also meet with community groups. I am the school's representative to over 60 agencies that deal with youthful drug abuse, and it is one of the toughest but most satisfying jobs I do, to pull this together. We approve drug abuse curriculum and we have police liaison teams that do enforcement, we have doubled the size of those. We have strenthened our board policy on drug abuse. We trained 50 trainers to come and do what originally this Department of Education did for us, and as I said, we have a staff now that can keep the program going in the schools.

Let me tell you what we have been able to do. Here are some statistics. The J. P. Elder Middle School, had a 90-percent reduction in drug cases as a result of our efforts out there. The school had been in a crisis situation. Cars had to slow down to keep from running over students who had been sniffing paint.

After 3 years this program is still having a 40- to 50-percent impact on the situation. At Polytechnic High School, these people went out to one of the school team training programs, came back and got a 65-percent cut in students' drug offenses and, they still say this is holding level. This next data I discovered getting ready for this testimony. We handle every pupil who is caught doing a drug offense, and everyone who is arrested and sent back to us, through our court-related office. Since this school team program started in 1976, until now, we have had a 25-percent reduction in the number of pupils that have been processed for drug offenses. We think 25 percent is very significant.

We have had a 9-percent reduction of student population. But, still a 25-percent reduction in pupil drug offenses we think is very high, and it coincides with the efforts of this school team program. It is clear that our data shows, that we are doing something positive and corrective. We therefore think that the national program

should be continued, because it is effective in our school system, we think it is cost-effective nationally, it fits well into the schools, and it offers strong followup assistance to reduce substance abuse, while at the same time helping them to become better schools.

If technical assistance is needed—and there are other school systems that need help, they sometimes call me. I got a call last week from one that was begging me, down on the Mexican border, McAllen, please, can you help us, we will put money into it, we will do anything. Many school systems need this program.

As a professional in this field, and a man who has lived through this himself, and has had to look desperately for the answers, and as the head of the school drug abuse program in Fort Worth, it is my opinion that this is a cost-effective, essential program, and we want to urge its continuation. Whatever it takes, I think increased funding would certainly be indicated.

I am one of those who feel that if it does go to the States, that the program will lose its effectiveness. We have come too far with this excellent program to quit now.

Thank you.

[The introductory statement regarding requested information and prepared statement of Mr. Boyd follows:]

FORT WORTH INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
OFFICE FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF DISCIPLINE AND LEARNING ENVIRONMENT
3210 WEST LANCASTER
FORT WORTH, TEXAS 76107

MARVIN BOYD
Coordinator

April 17, 1981

The Honorable Gordon J. Humphrey
United States Senator
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20501

Dear Senator Humphrey:

As requested I am returning my transcript of corrected testimony to you. You also requested a list of four or five programs that we have instituted as a result of the Centers training. This was to include the name of the program, what it does, and what its results are, etc.

In my written testimony to the committee pages 3 through 7, (See attached copy.) I listed 19 such programs that have been implemented as a result of our association with the National Alcohol and Drug Abuse Program. I believe that all of these programs are contributing to the 25% reduction in cases of students' drug abuse that have been handled in our school system since this program began.

Your special attention is called to the School and Student Team Programs, which are discussed on page 3 of my written testimony. A three year study indicated that this program had reduced drugs on campus significantly.

The Student-Peer Alcohol Education Program discussed on page 4, has been tested and found to improve attitudes toward the destructive use of alcohol. This program has been so successful that our School Board Task Force is recommending its expansion into all of our secondary schools. It was in three high schools.

The Employee Assistance Program which is discussed on page 4 of my written testimony helps our employees with their chemical abuse problems. This program has received greater use in our school system than in any of 20 other companies and organizations using the program in this geographical area.

The drug abuse prevention programming in our alternative schools for suspended students is multidimensional. A full time prevention specialist is used. The design and training for this program came from the Center. Early data seem to indicate success in reducing drug abuse through this program. The full study will not be available for another few months.

The Drug Abuse Peer-Education Program discussed on page 5 of my written testimony involves having 11th grade students take the latest marijuana information to 9th grade students. We did this program this year in one high school and the evaluation was such that our School Board Task Force has recommended the expansion of the program to other high schools and all middle schools.

April 17, 1981
Page 2

In regard to involving the community in our programming, I would like to call your attention to the School Board Task Force on page 3, the Parents' Evening Training Program on page 5, the Community Parent-Peer Support groups on page 5, and the Placement of School Representatives on Community and Governmental Boards on page 6. In addition this office is responsible to several community advisory boards.

I think that you know by now that I believe that this approach to the problem of substance abuse in the schools has merit and that its continuation would benefit our nation's youth.

Senator Humphrey, I want to thank you for the sincere and dedicated efforts that you are making to sort this matter out and come to a conclusion.

Thank you also for the opportunity to share this program with you and your committee. I am sending you, under seperate cover, a copy of my text book, Turning on to Better Living.

Please call on me if I can be of any further help.

Sincerely,

Marvin Boyd

Marvin Boyd
Coordinator

/b
encls:

(Note: In the interest of economy, the book referred to "Turning on to Better Living," was retained in the files of the committee.)

TESTIMONY BY MARVIN BOYD, COORDINATOR OF IMPROVEMENT OF DISCIPLINE AND LEARNING ENVIRONMENT FOR THE FORT WORTH INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT, BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ALCOHOLISM AND DRUG ABUSE ON APRIL 6, 1981, 4232 DIRKSEN SENATE OFFICE BUILDING, 9:30 AM

Senator Gordon Humphrey and members of the committee: Thank you for your invitation to appear before this committee. Because the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Act is up for re-authorization this year and because the Fort Worth Independent School District (FWISD) has participated actively in the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program since July 1976, it seems fitting that we accept your invitation to share with your committee our school district's experience with this program.

I have been in charge of the alcohol and drug abuse prevention programming in the FWISD for the past five and one-half years. In addition to my certification as a public school teacher and administrator, I am also a state certified alcoholism counselor and have conducted educational groups for alcoholics and drug addicts in clinical settings for the past twelve years. In addition to my duties as an administrator in the FWISD, I presently counsel federal prisoners, probationers, and parolees who have a history of committing crimes as a consequence of alcohol and drug abuse. I have also authored a textbook on drug abuse prevention, which is used in our fifth-grade classrooms. Also, it is a state-adopted textbook in one state and is used in various schools

throughout the nation. In addition, I authored a multi-media program on drug and alcohol abuse prevention under a National Institute on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse grant.

In December 1975, I became the administrator of our school system's drug and alcohol abuse prevention programming. Eight months later we participated in our first training session with the National Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program. Since 1976, we have had continual training and consultation with the national program.

There are no easy answers to drug abuse prevention. To seek only easy answers is to avoid reality. Having good schools is one of the best means possible of helping the schools to reduce drug abuse. However, more specific measures are also required. A study of prevention program evaluations in 127 school systems that was conducted for the National Institute on Drug Abuse in 1978, indicated that multidimensional prevention programs were successful while single strategy programs were not. The study also indicated that student peers and parents were the highest influence groups for presentations of such programs.

The programming of the FWISD is multidimensional and seeks to utilize student peers and parents to a considerable degree. The following programs and activities represent our school district's prevention and intervention efforts that can be largely attributed

to training and consultation with the national Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program:

1. The FWISD established 38 school teams and 15 student teams. These school and student teams implement activities designed to improve school conditions in order to enhance the well-being of students. Data is available to indicate that discipline problems have reduced and academic achievement has increased. A three-year study indicates that drugs available on campus have reduced. When this program was used at the J. P. Elder Middle School, school records showed that drug abuse cases handled in the school office reduced by 90%. The principal at Elder, three years later, attributed a 40% to 50% reduction in drug abuse problems to these efforts. Polytechnic High School implemented a "Clean Sweep" drug abuse prevention program as a result of the national training and reported a 75% cut in the amount of drug offenses handled by the school. This program involved actual apprehension of users and pushers in areas in and around the school that were known to be high in drug abuse activity. Two years later the principal reported the frequency of drug problems reduced from one to two a week, to one to two a semester.
2. The FWISD established a school board task force on alcohol and drug concerns. This task force was authorized by the school board to determine the extent of drug problems and

to recommend possible action. The committee meets two hours a week; it consists of citizens such as parents, educators, social agency professionals, narcotics officers, business leaders, religious leaders, and professionals in the field of substance abuse. Findings by this task force will be used to continue to up-grade drug and alcohol abuse prevention programming in the system.

3. The FWISD established an Employee Assistance Program. This program offers free and confidential referral counseling to employees of the school system who are experiencing personal problems including alcohol and drug abuse.
4. The FWISD established a student-peer alcohol education program. Ths program trains high school students to teach alcohol abuse prevention in middle school science classrooms.
5. The FWISD employeed at district expense a staff of five people to implement this programming. The Improvement of Discipline and Learning Environment's staff is charged with improving discipline including the reduction of alcohol and drug abuse among students in the schools.
6. The FWISD established a drug abuse prevention program in our alternative schools for suspended stucents which includes a full-time drug abuse prevention specialist. This program targets on students who have been suspended from school for disciplinary reasons including drug abuse. Such students can attend one of three schools designed to help them rehabilitate while maintaining academic progress. A drug abuse prevention specialist gives special attention to

students with chemical problems and helps direct a total program designed to help students to become drug free and to re-enter the regular school program.

7. The FWISD began a drug abuse peer-education program designed to encourage students to be "drug free." This program trains eleventh-grade students to present recent information on the destructiveness of marijuana use to ninth-grade students. The program is being piloted in one high school this year and will be expanded if effective.
8. The FWISD established an evening training program for all parents in the school district, which helps parents become preventers of drug abuse in their own families. Parents who have concerns about their children's abuse or potential abuse or chemicals can attend this program. Parents develop skills for handling such problems within their own families. Students are also allowed to attend with their parents. Students who are suspended from school for drug violations and who attend the alternative schools are required to attend this program with their parents.
9. The FWISD helped to establish community parent-peer support groups to deal with the prevention of youthful drug abuse. This office is offering support to parent-peer groups modeled after the Dekalb County, Georgia, parent-peer program. Such groups meet with parents of children who associate socially. These parents support legislative

change, set behavioral norms for their children, and support one another in helping their children to be drug free.

10. The FWISD places school representatives on most local community and governmental boards concerned with alcohol and drug abuse reduction among students.
11. The FWISD gave leadership to and participated in a community collaboration of 60 agencies that, among other goals, are working to prevent youthful drug abuse.
12. The FWISD improved and increased district curriculum which is designed to reduce students' drug abuse.
13. The FWISD increased the number of teams to enforce school policy on alcohol and drug abuse. The school system's court related office, which is responsible for enforcement of school board policy including drug violations, consists of two administrators, five school-police liaison teams, a supervisor, and 35 campus monitors.
14. The FWISD revised school board policy on alcohol and drug abuse to establish more definite guidelines and enforcement of such policy. Pupils who use, carry, or possess mood-changing drugs including alcohol are subject to suspension and on second offense in the same school year are suspended for the remainder of the school year.
15. The FWISD established coordinators in every school to communicate information on alcohol and drug abuse to teachers.

16. The FWISD developed a pamphlet on "What the Fort Worth Independent School District is Doing About Drug Abuse." This pamphlet gives parents information about resources for helping to prevent and handle drug abuse problems.
17. The FWISD began a resource room lending library on drug and alcohol information. Teachers can check out materials for use in the classrooms or arrange for programs for their students from school and community resources.
18. The FWISD released the program's administrator whenever appropriate to work with other school districts in improving drug and alcohol abuse prevention. The school system has also networked with other school systems as a means of mutual program improvement.
19. Fifty local trainers who can train others were trained. These trainers do inservice programs throughout the school district.

System-wide students' drug cases handled by our court related office have reduced by 25% since initiating the national program in 1976 while the student population has reduced by only 9%. This data plus the data given above, which was gathered in specific circumstances, indicates a highly significant reduction in incidents of drug abuse. The following points can be made about the effectiveness of the national Alcohol and Drug Abuse Program in relation to this school system's experiences:

1. The national program has inspired and given leadership to the FWISD which has resulted in the implementation of

numerous multifaceted programs and activities designed to help reduce alcohol and drug abuse among pupils.

2. The school system is at this time working vigorously to maintain the kind of educational program that will reduce incidents of destructive drug and alcohol use by pupils.
3. Surveys and measurements of the effectiveness of such programs indicate that they are effective.

This school district supports the continuation of the national program for the following reasons:

1. The national program has proven effective in this school system.
2. The national program is cost-effective.
3. The national program mediates easily in the schools.
4. The national program focuses on local solutions to drug and alcohol abuse problems.
5. The national program offers strong and effective follow-up and technical assistance to participating schools.
6. While helping to reduce alcohol and drug abuse, this national program helps the schools to become better in terms of discipline and academic achievement.
7. School systems know a lot about educating children but sometimes little about alcohol and drug abuse prevention and intervention. The national program has impressive expertise in both areas.

8. The FWISD still benefits from the technical assistance and consultation of the national program.
9. School districts that have not had the benefit of help from the national program need such help.

As a professional in the fields of public school education and substance abuse prevention, and as the director of the Fort Worth Independent School District substance abuse prevention program, it is my opinion that no other program known to me is as cost-effective, constructive, and essential as the Alcohol and Drug Education School Team Program. We want to urge the continuation of this program in its present form, so that alterations will not occur that could reduce the program's success. If funding for this program is placed with other programs' funding and this program's continuation is left to the discretion of the states, the program's effectiveness could be impaired or lost. Two million dollars is little to spend to insure that this successful program remains an option to our nation's schools.

Thank you.

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you, Mr. Boyd.

Ms. Barrick?

Ms. BARRICK. Let me tell you just a little about my background——

Senator HUMPHREY. Will you pull the microphone closer, please?

Ms. BARRICK. I became interested, and was given the position of writing and implementing a drug education program for the school system, in Nashville in 1972. There were 90,000 students enrolled at that time in the public schools. That was a big order for one person to undertake.

I wanted to speak to this issue because I think in contrast to the school-team approach, I would like to tell you some of the things that took place. The pilot program was successful, we worked with student peer leaders. However, it was very difficult to continue to fund a program like that. We did continue through National Science Foundation grants to train teachers, so we went the route of training individuals to work in a school setting. I think the bottom line is that this was a very difficult task to accomplish. We do not change an organizational structure, we do not change a school climate by changing a few people.

In 1977, Nashville became involved with USED, at that time USOE, region IV, and the school-team approach. I think it might be appropriate that you know my background, and know that I have been involved with drug education from the grassroots level.

I would like to speak to four issues. First, I would like to speak just a bit about the school-team approach, the impact of this approach on our system, some hard impact data, and lastly, I would like to make a few recommendations.

I came to testify before this committee today as an educator, a parent, and a concerned citizen. I am concerned about our society, its behavior, and specifically the impact our society's behavior has on the education of the youth in this country.

I was asked to speak specifically to the issue of drug and alcohol abuse prevention education, specifically to the impact of the programs which our system has implemented, because of our affiliation with USED, region IV. But drugtaking does not exist in a vacuum. It is woven into the psychological, sociological, and even cultural fibers of our lives.

If one could just remove the so-called drug problem, I fear our problems would not be solved. It has been determined that the drug problem—that drugtaking is a people problem, which stems from a lack of something—peace of mind, acceptance by others, or even self-acceptance, power, yes, even youth wish to have a certain amount of control over their lives, self-esteem, or other emotional, social, or psychological needs.

Globally, the UN claims that drug use may be threatening the stability of the world. Marihuana is now believed to be the No. 1 money crop in our country. One-half of all accidents involves alcohol. Suicide and accidents are the top causes of deaths of teenagers. Persons 18 to 25 commit a large number of crimes. One study has shown that 14-year-olds commit a high percent of violent crimes.

The bottom line is that these people problems must be the problems that educators and legislators address if we are going to improve our drug and alcohol-related dilemma, as well as school

vandalism, assault on teachers, use of weapons, including firearms, lack of goal orientation, and so forth.

Schools and society must focus on primary prevention and intervention. After the fact of drug abuse it is too late for schools to address that issue. They lack the skills and capacity to enter into treatment. The school-team approach, in my estimation, is the most rational approach of getting at those problems in a school setting that youth have, that cause them to use drugs to minimize their discomfort, or maximize their pleasures.

The approach is one which is based on the theory of organizational development. Simply stated, schools, through the involvement of the administrator with a team, make a sustained effort to educate the whole child. That implies the child's intellectual, social and emotional needs. Outside pressures are now stressing cognitive needs, maybe to the detriment of the child's whole being. Neither does learning take place in a vacuum, but it is influenced by the child's needs, motivations and goals.

The school's team examines carefully what an ideal environment would be, in order to help all children reach their highest potential, intellectually and emotionally, and to learn to cope with every day stresses. This, ladies and gentlemen, may not sound like drug abuse prevention education, but yet when the team determines priorities based upon needs, and begins a slow process which can help make the school environment one that is safe, inviting, and fosters academic and emotional achievement * * * this is the essence of drug and alcohol prevention education.

The school-team approach is flexible—we have already heard that today—it allows schools to write their own prescriptions, and the entire process can lead to changes in the total organizational structure. Changes, which we must point clearly to, are those that affect the interpersonal relationship of the whole staff. Students are the first to take note that there is mutual trust, open communication, and participatory decisionmaking among the whole staff. This relationship affects every student. Students' needs are top priority, and some of the people problems which students have can be dealt with. We have heard a hungry child cannot learn. The Head Start program resulted from that premise, and now we know that a child disturbed because of peer relations, academic failure, or parents' conflict, cannot only not learn, but is vulnerable to accept any available means of coping, including the use of alcohol and drugs.

As I view it, the school-team approach is to help schools find those educationally and economically cost-effective ways to create a climate which gets all students high on learning and living in a pluralistic society.

I will briefly summarize the program that we have had, and trace the history of the programs in Nashville, and then, since you have my written testimony, you may ask questions later.

We became involved in the fall of 1977. There were four schools, with five team members each. All schools had an administrator, four other staff members, and one school happened to have a parent on its team. The training was excellent. Our teams came away from the training cycle excited about the fact that they could probably make some changes in their school environment.

At the end of that first year—and I will not mention those programs, all the action plans were implemented, and we felt that we had a very successful beginning.

In 1978-79, we asked for continuation funding. During the beginning of that year, I would just like to allude to a few things that happened. We had a new comprehensive high school with 1,800 students with which one of our school teams wanted to share their programs for drug abuse prevention.

Region IV provided consultants to work with the faculties from both schools for a 1 day workshop. The program provided participants with an overview of the drug scene, and an orientation to the school-team approach for the prevention and reduction of drug and alcohol abuse. At the conclusion of the workshop, approximately 50 of the 100 faculty members of the new school were interested in forming a school team. A team was trained with, region IV's help. The major focus of the team's efforts has been directed toward a student positive action team. The student team has worked to improve student relationships.

Also, during that year, one other school was interested in impacting the entire district. We at that time had three districts in Nashville. With the help of region IV, we went through some processes which I want to mention because these are important to the success of a school-team approach. First of all, we were able to gain the support of the district superintendent. The school-team approach will not work unless we have top management commitment, and that means from the superintendent down to the administrator in the school. Next, we planned a principal's orientation workshop for the 15 schools we wished to impact. At the conclusion of the workshop one principal remarked to me, "I thought I was just coming to another workshop, and spending 2 days away from school. But I have really been impressed, and I cannot wait to get to work."

The spinoff from the principal's workshop was that we had 15 school teams, 5 members each, who were trained, during the summer of 1979. We had expanded our program to include 15 schools, within a period of a year and a half after our initial training. Two of those schools were elementary schools.

I am going to go rather quickly, because I want to touch upon some of the highlights of our programs. From 1979 to the present, we have expanded to include six elementary schools and seven active secondary school teams. We have three schools with student peer tutoring and peer counseling teams. I think there are some things that you cannot communicate in writing. You have to meet the students, and talk with them, and know how they feel about the impact that they are having on their fellow classmates, in order to really understand what the true impact is. I think you have to also walk into a school to get the feel of the climate, to realize the impact of the school-team approach.

Other than the peer counseling teams, we have developed a community program. This community program was definitely able to develop because of our involvement with the USED region IV.

It is strange but true that a consultant who flies in with the briefcase can do so much more to influence people to change, than can those of us at home.

82-644 O - 81 - 6

We had a community group made up of interested men and women from the chamber of commerce, the Jewish League of Women, the Junior League, and Mental and Health Centers, who were asking what could be done to alleviate the perceived drug and alcohol problem in Nashville. With the help of region IV consultants, we were able to work through this problem and concern, and today we have a youth forum, made up of about 50 parent volunteers, who are on call to work in our schools. Presently they are facilitating parent groups. The parent groups are the parents of students who are going through a self-concept program at their schools. This self-concept program is another part of our networking system that we have developed. Rap-house, and Mid-Cumberland Council, which is a regional drug and alcohol center, provide the staff to go out and work with students. We are very proud of our community group, and hope that they are going to serve us well as an advocacy group. Another program that I wish to mention is one that we call our pro-team program. This is definitely a spinoff from the school-team approach. We have about 128 or 129 schools in Nashville. Last year we began a pro-team effort in every one of those schools. All of our schools have formed a pro-team, using the same model as the school-team approach. The principal must be on the team, and four to five members of his staff. The major focus of these pro-teams was to do a needs assessment in the school, relative to planning in-service training, which is mandated by our State. The programs for in-service training would be planned to meet the needs of the faculty and the students. Last year all schools teams functioned, and the reports from the district offices have been very good.

We just last week met with these teams again, to make plans for the same process for the coming year. I do not want to sound as if these teams have all the expertise that our trained teams have, but they have some superficial expertise which we hope can continue to develop.

Senator HUMPHREY. Will you permit me to nudge you along?

Ms. BARRICK. I will just give you some data, and move along.

In one school, where we have had a peer counseling program, since 1978, we had an overall decrease in suspensions of 67.7 percent. This datum is found in the written testimony. We also had, in that same school, a decrease of 93 percent in drug and alcohol suspensions. The six active secondary schools, have had an increase in attendance, roughly between 1 and 3 percent, since they have been involved with the school-team approach. Our overall system increase in attendance has been 0.7 percent. All of our peer counseling teams have taken the Piers-Narris self-concept scale. A random sampling of the same number of nontrained students also responded to the same scale. Trained students showed a more positive self-concept with a 0.05 confidence level and $t=3.75$.

Do I have time for a couple of recommendations?

Senator HUMPHREY. Sure, I guess that is the most important part.

Ms. BARRICK. First of all, I know of no other approach that is comparable to the ideology of the school-team approach which, it is really getting at the people problem.

The second recommendation that I would make is, unless top management has given commitments to the region offices to become involved, I think they are really wasting time and money. I think this is very important.

I would even suggest gaining the support of school boards, superintendents, and all administrators who will be involved.

My third recommendation has to do with evaluation. It is difficult to evaluate these programs, and I think local school districts need help. We need guidance and direction in ways to really show that these programs do work.

Thank you.

[The following material was received for the record:]

Abstract

The Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools became involved with the School Team Approach to Prevent or Reduce Alcohol and Drug Abuse, as well as other forms of self-destructive behavior in the fall of 1977. The original four teams have expanded to include twenty school teams. Presently, thirteen teams are actively involved with USED Region IV. Six of these active teams are in elementary schools.

Programs and activities which have been implemented in the schools with teams have included peer tutoring and counseling, a faculty-family retreat, a student-faculty retreat, parenting workshops, school pride programs, team building, training of trainers, stress management, communication, decision-making skills, training cycle for teams, administrators' workshop, conflict resolution, and alternative programs.

Cluster activities have resulted in a Youth Forum which is an active community group. Each school in the school system has formed a Pro-Team. A networking system is beginning to function which includes resources from community agencies.

Evaluation data, although not extensive, show that attendance in the secondary schools with teams has improved more than the systemwide attendance. In one of the original schools with a team where a peer counseling program has been active there has been a decrease in overall suspensions by 67.6 percent.

The Nashville Cluster has top management's support for the School Team Approach. Several recommendations are presented for consideration.

The School Team Approach in Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools

I. Background Information

Metropolitan Public Schools became involved with the United States Office of Education (now USED) School Team Approach to Prevent or Reduce Drug and Alcohol Abuse in November, 1977. Four teams, representing three secondary schools and one junior high school, became participants in the initial training for the School Team Approach. Each team was composed of an administrator, one guidance counselor, and three teachers; additionally one team had a parent member. A coordinator of the program was also a participant with the four teams in the training cycle.

The training cycle was planned and implemented by the staff at Region IV USED. The format for training was based on the philosophical foundation that drug abuse is a "people problem" and that the implementation of the training would follow the organizational change process. The training program followed an intensive ten-day schedule. The final product, a plan of action, for the four schools from Nashville was produced for each school which included a needs assessment, prioritization of needs, objectives, activities to reach the identified objectives, and an evaluation of the program.

II. Nature of Impact

1977-78:

The four teams were successful in meeting their commitment which they established in their action plans the first year. Programs implemented included parenting workshops, alternative programs for students with disruptive behaviors, orientation sessions for the faculties, parent tutoring, and extra-curricular activities for all students, and special workshops for parents, teachers and students.

1978-79:

In 1978-79 the Nashville Cluster applied for continuation funding with USOE. The four original teams submitted plans. A new comprehensive high school's faculty was invited by one of the teams to share an inservice program with their faculty. The program had been planned as an orientation to the drug scene and drug prevention strategies. Fifty percent of the new school's faculty indicated a strong desire to have a school team. USED supported the development of this new team and today the team is functioning well. The most salient feature of this team's approach is a Student Positive Action Team of about fifty trained students.

Programs for the five teams during 1978-79 included the training of trainers workshops, developing a peer program, team training for the new school team and other new team members, a retreat for students and a faculty team, an orientation workshop for fifteen principals, and advanced team training. The workshop for the principals was in preparation for a training cycle for fifteen school teams.

1979-80:

The four school teams grew to fifteen in the Nashville Cluster. All teams, even the new ones functioned, although all were at different levels of maturity. Three of the original school teams were still involved and two elementary school teams had been added. See attached Item I which is a summary of activities from the teams, showing the number of students, parents, and students involved with team activities. It was an exciting year for the cluster. The cluster had top management's endorsement of the program. Cluster meetings were rally-like in atmosphere. Two schools had begun peer tutoring and counseling programs and reports were excellent concerning the acceptance of programs by faculties, students, and parents. See Management Plan for 79-80 - Item 2.

1980-81:

During the present year a strong new dimension has been added to the programs in Nashville. Six elementary teams have been in the process of being trained. These teams represent almost 100 percent of the faculties of each school. Some exciting programs are in progress. Most are focusing on improving faculty relationships, organizational climate, and on building self concept for children. A parent component will help to re-enforce what the school is doing for the students.

These elementary schools are committed to collecting data which will help to validate the value of their programs. Attached Item III is representative of one kind of impact data these schools are collecting. Seven other elementary schools requested help from USED, however, the initial team training had to be held for a later date.

There are presently seven active teams among the secondary schools. Peer counseling/tutoring programs are found in three schools. Peer influence is of utmost value during adolescence and these programs are well received by the faculties, students and parents. Members of these peer groups have rendered valuable services to their school organizations and as documentation shows, the self concept of the peer counselor is greatly enhanced. Research shows that the training provided the students brings about improved academic grades also. Other activities include motivation of students, school pride programs, attendance projects, and faculty workshops which grow out of needs assessments in each school.

The Community Group

In January 1979 a group of interested and concerned parents, educators, civic and social organizations representatives, mental health workers, and the Director of the Chamber of Commerce met to discuss the perceived drug and alcohol problem among the youth of Nashville. A request was made to the USED Region IV for guidance and support. After two years of learning, training, and growing there is now a Youth Forum, which is a group of trained volunteers, speakers, and advocates for drug abuse prevention in this community. Presently, there are members who are working with the parents of students who are participating in a school program to improve self-esteem. A local drug treatment center provides the consultants for the student programs. USED Region IV played a viable role from the beginning of this project. Consultants met with the group on numerous occasions and consultants led the group, including students, in a workshop on planning for change. It is rather doubtful that this organization would exist if it had not been for the credibility, encouragement, and expertise of the consultants provided by Region IV USED.

Networking

As some of our teams have become somewhat mature there are persons who are capable of assisting other less mature teams. We are trying to build a support system. Principals in the elementary cluster are inviting a "buddy" principal to participate in workshops so that they can learn more of the team concept. Peer counselors from one school have presented programs to all secondary schools administrators and student representatives. The Student Positive Action Team from a large comprehensive high school presented a program to the State Guidance Association in 1980.

The Community Youth Forum has conducted programs for parents in schools, churches, and other organizations. Local community agencies including Rap House, Mid-Cumberland Council, and Family and Children Service are now more involved with our public schools because of the Youth Forum. These examples are representative of our efforts to make use of all of our local resources.

Administrative Support

The Director of Schools, the District I Superintendent, and the Directors of Secondary and Elementary Education have supported the concept of drug education as perceived by USED. At the district level, the Superintendent and his staff have given support to the activities by their presence and by their testimonies. For organizational development efforts in public schools to be successful it is necessary for the leaders of a system, as well as the administrators of schools to be involved and committed. Without this top leadership support teams are likely to fold up at the first sign of unrest or outside pressure.

Pro-Teams

A spin-off of the School Team Approach was the systemwide move to establish Pro-Teams in all 129 schools in 1980. The initial purpose for the formation of these teams was to improve the local school professional staff development inservice training programs mandated by the State and the local system. The orientation for all principals was conducted by consultants provided by USED Region IV. After the principals' orientation session, teams were formed at each school. All teams received training which prepared them to do school needs assessments, establish priorities, write objectives, plan activities and programs, and evaluate the inservice programs. Reports to District Offices have verified the success of a small beginning to impact all schools with a team approach. Presently, teams are being encouraged to include parents on their teams. The purpose is to get more parental involvement and support.

III. Statistical Data

I. Attendance for the last two years for six of the secondary schools is shown below. The seventh school which housed grades 7-12 has become a 7th and 8th grade school this year and data would not be considered reliable.

Percentage of Yearly Attendance in Schools With Teams

School yr.	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81 (4th mo.)
Goodlettsville High	92.9	92.3	94.4	94
Whites Creek		91.1	91.7	91
Madison High		91.9	92.8	94
Ewing Park		93.0	92.7	95
Meigs		84.8	86.7	87
East		82.9	83.7	84
Entire System		92.3	93.0	

The above information was prepared by the Attendance Division of Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools on March 25, 1981.

With the exception of one school the attendance has improved in each of these schools from 1 to 3 percent since their involvement with the school team approach. Systemwide, the attendance for the same period has improved .7 percent.

II. Goodlettsville High School, one of the original teams, has been able to involve their entire faculty in programs for improving the school climate. With the help of USED a family/faculty/peer counselor retreat was held at a State Park. The Peer Tutoring and Counseling program was begun in the fall of 1978. Documentation of the successfulness of the team's efforts may be shown by the reductions in overall suspensions. Also note in Item 4 that drug and alcohol related suspensions dropped from 14 to 1 (or 93%) during the year after the peer program started. Overall suspensions decreased by 67.6%. This information was provided by the Research and Evaluation Department of Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools.

IV. The School Team Approach

Since the early 1960's several thrusts have been directed toward drug abuse prevention. First, it was believed that teaching the facts would deter the use and abuse of drugs. When that method was found to fail school programs began to emerge that were implemented by a trained drug educator. It was soon discovered that one or two individuals could not impact a student body nor change the attitudes of a school's staff. As more educators

began to examine closely the drug dilemma it was determined that drug abuse was only a symptom of "people problems". Other forms of student disruptive behavior could also be responses to problems such as poor self-esteem, family or school conflicts, a sense of powerlessness or poor interpersonal skills.

The School Team Approach has as its ultimate target, helping students. The theoretical concept of organizational development upon which the School Team Approach is based is a structured plan for change; change that can bring about an improved school climate which can be mutually beneficial to the students, the school staff, and the community.

The School Team Approach provides a support group for the administrator, makes decision-making more participatory, establishes a format for solving problems and enables more staff and students to feel an investment in the goals of the school. Programs and activities begin to be woven into the fiber of the school organization. The School Team Approach emphasizes the constant reassessment of needs which enables a school staff to be more receptive to change and eventually to become a "self-renewing school". Staff training is an important dimension of the School Team Approach. The training includes those elements of staff development which helps educators to be more concerned about students and each other.

V. Recommendations

The following recommendations are presented for your consideration:

1. Orientation workshops for Superintendents and Directors of School Systems.

2. More training in management for administrators of schools. Training should include the concept of organizational development.

3. Orientation programs or workshops for School Boards.

4. The training of school teams should include the concept of organization development and the examination of societal problem in general.

5. Teams which have been formed must be supported with technical assistance often during the first two years. It must be remembered that those teams must function after regular school assignments and duties.

6. Emphasis should be given to the development of programs at the elementary level, in which educators and parents are both involved. Prevention of drug abuse should be given top priority, since research supports the failure of most treatment programs.

7. The secondary school emphasis should include peer programs which develop leadership among the students. Students can become the schools' best resources.

8. Public school systems are understaffed in the area of research and evaluation. There is a lack of data to show that programs for prevention really reduce or prevent alcohol and drug abuse. A strong recommendation is that the Drug and Alcohol Abuse Act should give a high priority to helping school systems to establish and maintain evaluation techniques. We as educators need help in order to document with hard data the impact of programs.

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES IMPLEMENTED BY THE 15 SCHOOLS WITH FORMAL DRUG EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Item 1

August, 1979 - May, 1980	Majority of Teams Reporting
Total Number of Activities Conducted	138
Total Number of Students Involved	15,826
Total Number of Teachers Involved	3,290
Total Number of Administrators Involved	173
Total Number of Parents Involved	612
Total Number of Support Personnel Involved	266

Types of Activities Conducted

Problem Solving: Tardiness
Problem Solving: School Facilities
Climate Assessment
Gifted/Talented Packets
Competency Testing for Parents
Group Counseling: Absenteeism, success/failure, life goals
Positive Discipline
Stereotypic Behavior
Classroom Self-Awareness
School Pride
Stress Management
Peer Counseling
Personal Development
How to Avoid Conflicts
School Faculty Relationships
Black History Assembly
Multicultural Awareness
Attendance
Developing Peer Counseling Manual
Advanced Training of Trainers Workshop
Student Peer Tutoring Program
Student Training Cycle
Evaluation of Program - by Teachers

DuPont Elementary School | 586 Enrollment | K-6 Grade Level | 26 Teaching Staff | Item 3

Special Programs and/or Services

DATA COLLECTING AREAS FOR SCHOOL TEAM CLUSTER PROJECT

DISRUPTIONS OF EDUCATION PROCESS	Sept.	Jan.	Feb.	March	April	May
ATTENDANCE absenteeism rate	98% Present	92%	93%			
rate of unexcused absences	0	1%	1%			
TARDINESS to school	7	14	18			
to class	0	0	0			
DISCIPLINE REFERRALS for verbal aggression: To Adults	5	3	6	3		
To Students	8	10	12	8		
for physical aggression: To Adults	0	0	0	0		
To Students	2	6	7	5		
for lack of preparedness for class	0	0	0	0		
classroom disruption	9	11	8	10		
for drug use	3	0	0	0		
DISRUPTIONS OCCUR IN: classroom	13	10	12	10		
hallway	4	3	7	3		
cafeteria	2	9	6	6		
playground	3	0	4	5		
school bus	5	8	4	2		
REFERRALS to office/administration						
to student services	0	9	6	4		
to outside agencies	0	2	0	1		

	Sept.	Jan.	Feb.	March	April	May
INTERVENTIONS (Discipline Refferals) suspensions	3	0	0	0		
in-school transfers	0	0	0	0		
intra-school transfers	0	0	0	0		
outside placements (agencies)	0	0	0	0		
expulsions	0	0	0	0		
special programs within school	0	0	20	20		
PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT WITH: STUDENTS:						
conferences (before problems)	7	4	2	1		
conferences (after problems)	4	1	0	0		
telephone contacts	7	10	4	3		
written contacts general (newsletters, etc.)	3	3	2	4		
specific (to parent)	2	4	0	0		
other	70	0	60	45		
SCHOOL: special P.T.A. meetings	1	1	1	0		
CAC meeting	1	0	0	2		
L-PAC meeting	0	0	0	0		
special parent workshops	4	0	0	0		
study groups/seminars	4	0	0	0		

SPECIAL NOTES OR COMMENTS:

Item 4

NUMBER SUSPENSIONS BY REASON
Goodlettsville High School

REASON	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	Total
Cutting class, assembly, homeroom	10	8	3	
Truant	2	0	0	
Tardy	6	1	0	
Refusing to obey or take punishment	14	10	2	
Disrespectful	13	13	7	
Disturbance in class, hall, cafeteria or bus, homeroom	7	4	2	
Profane or indecent language	5	7	3	
Smoking	42	24	9	
Fighting with students	2	4	0	
Threatening	0	3	0	
Destructive to property	1	1	0	
Cruelty	0	0	0	
Abusive to others	0	2	0	
Stealing from students	1	1	3	
Stealing from teachers or school	0	0	0	
Extortion	0	0	0	
Possession and/or use of drugs or having in possession paraphernalia for doing so	9	14	1	
Selling drugs	4	0	0	
Possession and/or use of knife				
Possession and/or use of firearm				
Possession and/or use of other weapon-like object	0	0	0	
Attacks on teachers				
Attacks on administrators				
Possession and/or use of alcohol	0	0	0	
Indecent exposure				
Disruptive behavior	5	8	1	
Leaving school campus	0	2	2	
Gambling				
Unspecified	0	0	0	
TOTAL	117	102	33	19 1st Sem.

Point out these - 69 and 82 Reduced 69 in yr 67.6%

69/102 =

3/26/81

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you, Ms. Barrick.

Mr. Kaufman?

Mr. KAUFMAN. Thank you, Senator Humphrey. I am a little sorry that Mr. Hays has left. Perhaps some of your discussion will get back to the point about block grant programs. I certainly do disagree with Mr. Hays, including the evaluation.

I know what I face in our community, and when I see youngsters who are being helped, then that is an evaluation for me.

My testimony—my purpose is to voice support with the reauthorization of the Alcohol and Drug Education Act, and to encourage funding, at least at the same $3 million level as is currently available for the National Training Institute, and particularly because of our needy experience with the National Training Institute at Aldelphi University, I guess it is technically Region II of the Training Resource Center of the U.S. Department of Education.

There are three reasons that Bristol Township uses this reauthorization of funding. The first reason is that the Institute's program brings results in combating drug and alcohol abuse, and other student behavior.

The second reason is that the current pattern of team training, and the results achieved at the local level are costeffective. An extremely important issue for these days.

The third reason is that we continue to need the services of the Institute.

As to the first, getting results, it is absolutely the most effective training program we have ever encountered in our district. There is direct evidence of the effectiveness in the testimony. A couple of examples.

The late comers at one senior high school used to spend time before school with exchanging money for all kinds of illicit substances, other kinds of disruptive behavior, breaking windows, were formed into an Outreach program. We have experienced 100 percent more time attendance, I do not need any better statistic than that.

The students are proud of the fact that they have already saved the lives of two shutins. They are also proud of their ability to regionalize their efforts. One of the goals that we are after since the institute's training.

Another example is the senior success center, at one of our high schools, involving 32 seniors in danger of not graduating—there were more than 32, but those were the only ones we were able to grab at this time. We have 32 trainers. So that the students who earlier turned to drugs, not all of them were involved in drugs, but many of them were, alcohol and vandalism, they are now motivated to succeed in school, and graduating with their class.

Still another example of major progress, to me, is that total absence of smoking marihuana, vandalizing equipment, and abusing the personnel on a school bus. These results are directly attributable to the application of the newly learned skills from Adelphi by the high school team. All prior efforts to correct the situation failed.

Now, the traditional thing that we do, we suspend, and eventually we expel. In addition to specific program implementation results,

there is other evidence, at least in my view, of the effectiveness of the Adelphi school team approach in training.

First of all, people who are trained, are still active in the program in our schools. We have never before experienced 100 percent retention rate following any other training program.

Second, we have doubled the number of people on each team. Unlike the other testimony you have heard, we are relatively new in this.

Now, third, the board of education is so enthusiastic that they have agreed to participate as trainees themselves, the entire board, that is another first.

Improving the board's ability to cope with multifaceted broad-based problems will impact directly on school and climate. Another of our major goals.

The second reason that I stated that the act should be reauthorized and funded, not only has it produced results, it is cost-effective. I offer it as a fact that our teams work well beyond the school-day, they even work on weekends, and they share their expertise, all without asking for, or receiving extra pay. This is absolutely a first in our recent history, and it has gone well beyond the hollow effect. This work behavior occurs even for those team members who are in danger of being laid off next year, and I have been involved with, unfortunately, hundreds of layoffs over the last few years, with some concurrent rise in alcoholism and other things.

Another cost-effective item is the field training for Adelphi. We do not always have to go to them. Still another cost-effective aspect involves our effort to regionalize our efforts without additional cost to the taxpayers, and with considerably more cost-effectiveness and efficiency.

The program gets results, because Dr. Gerald Edwards, director of the Adelphi Center, and his staff, have developed the most comprehensive amalgam of theory and proven practice from the fields of psychology, medicine and human development that exists within our range of experience. All members of the institute staff work directly with the training program, and are all personally involved regularly in the field, including Dr. Edwards.

Also, because Dr. Edwards and his team have proven to us, at least, that they represent the highest level of professional performance as individuals, but more importantly, as a powerful team.

Being centralized at a training center reduces bureaucracy and attendant redtape and expense. Unlike what we heard earlier about centralizing, they are also cost-effective, because the institute maintains a relationship with participants, without creating a feeling of total dependence.

The third reason I stated for urging reauthorization of funding concerns our need for the services. We continue, for now, to meet the training institutes at Adelphi, to expand our programs, and to become truly independent in our efforts to cope with prevention and intervention in drug and alcohol abuse cases, and to create a climate throughout our community, which will eventually rid us of the ills and heartache that we see all around us.

For each of these three reasons, the results, cost-effectiveness, and continuing needs, Bristol Township urges the committee to recommend a reauthorization of the Drug Education Act, and fund-

ing for the National Training Institute for at least the same $3 million that is currently available.

We also urge the committee to recommend centralization of the work at Adelphi.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Kaufman follows:]

TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF REAUTHORIZATION OF THE ALCOHOL AND DRUG EDUCATION ACT

Submitted by:

Joseph S. Kaufman
Superintendent
Bristol Township School District
800 Coates Avenue
Bristol, Pennsylvania 19007

To:

Senate Subcommittee
on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse
Room 4232 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

April 6, 1981

82-644-0 - 81 - 7

Testimony to be presented to the Senate Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse on April 6, 1981 by Mr. Joseph S. Kaufman, Superintendent of Schools, Bristol Township, Pennsylvania

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to testify before this committee and to present you with a synopsis of Bristol Township School District's experience, involvement, and the outcomes to date, of our relationship with the National Training Institute of Adelphi University which is Region II of the Resource and Training Center for the U.S. Department of Education.

Our involvement with the Adelphi University National Training Institute began in 1979 when we heard of the Institute through a citizen of our community who directed us to the programs being conducted in Bergenfield, New Jersey, her home town. A committee of school board directors, school administrators and citizens of Bristol Township visited Bergenfield to observe their programs. The visit and subsequent discussions led to the scheduling of a Board/Administrative Workshop held during the summer of 1979. Dr. Gerald Edwards, Director of the Adelphi University National Training Institute, conducted a workshop entitled, "The Prevention of Crime and Disruption and Alcohol and Drug Abuse in the School and the Community." The workshop was attended by all Bristol Township school administrators and members of the school board.

The promise for a new, result oriented, community-wide approach to prevention as well as intervention sparked high enthusiasm among rather discouraged folks. As a result, a decision to seek funding from the Adelphi University National Training Institute was made by the Board during the summer of 1979. The proposal our school district submitted was formally approved and funding was granted on September 5, 1980.

In October, 1980, principals of three of the four schools who would be sending staff members to the training program and I, attended a three day leadership conference designed to make us aware of the training our school staffs would receive during their ten day residential workshop.

The workshop for the twenty-one members of the Bristol Township District cluster was held from November 16 to November 26, 1980. Our cluster was composed of four school teams of five members each. The teams were made up of twelve teachers and counselors, four administrators,

two non-uniformed Township police officers who are assigned to the schools in the district, one Board member and one citizen of the Township. A coordinator from the central office staff also attended. The participants often worked from 9:00 a.m. to approximately 11:00 p.m. or beyond each day. The level of involvement was so intense that at no time did I receive a complaint or a request to resign from the program.

The School Team Approach Training was unanimously evaluated by all who attended as the most positive educational experience they have ever had. In both written and oral statements, each participant expressed the idea that the workshop provided him/her with new "real" tools and ideas with which to approach school district efforts to control drug and alcohol abuse and other anti-social behavior. The individual and composite evaluations are supported by what is happening in our school district during the intervening four months. The results have been consistently positive.

As a result of programs instituted by the school teams, we have seen a positive attitudinal change in administrators, teachers and students. There is a perceptible improvement in classroom and school climate at each of the schools where National Training Institute programs have been implemented. Teachers are exhibiting a new enthusiasm and are volunteering to work to help students during their free and unassigned time, without additional pay - a most unusual occurrence.

The change in attitude and other results achieved, convince me that administrator, teacher, and student burnout is being lessened. Because of our dramatic success, other programs in the District are picking up on the Institute's model, most notably, the Title I program.

Another sign of success is that the trained teams in each of the four schools has already expanded its membership by five new members who are being trained on-site. Again, the trainers and the new participants volunteer their time at no additional cost to the District or the Institute.

I would like to report on specific programs that have been instituted as a result of the Adelphi University National Training Institute school team training.

In the high schools, the techniques taught by the National Training Institute staff have been used to:

1. Develop a Senior Success Center designed to help eliminate senior failures. The center is now serving fifty-one senior students who have been identified as possible failures. Thirty-two students are acting as peer group tutors, and thirty-six volunteer teachers, out of a staff of 108, donate one hour of their unassigned (free) time each week to supervise the center and help students.

The identification of the need for this project and the methods used to design and implement the program were made by administrators, teachers and students using the problem solving model learned at the Adelphi University National Training Institute. The project has succeeded in fostering a more trusting attitude between students and teachers. It has helped improve the self image of students who are failing, and as a result of that failure, were turning to outside stimuli, including drugs, alcohol and vandalism, as a means of venting their frustration. Although the final statistics will not be available until the end of the academic year, what has happened so far as a result of this program, holds great promise for success. We expect the Senior Success Center to become a permanent part of our high school program at no additional cost to the taxpayer.

2. The Police School Liaison Officer, who is a non-uniformed regular police officer assigned to the school by the Township Police Force, has begun a Drug Counseling Program in the school working with students who are having problems relating to the use of drugs. The officer is using techniques learned at the ten day residential workshop. Prior to training at the Adelphi University National Training Institute, all drug counseling for students was done by outside agencies. There was no daily and constant monitoring of the students' activities and progress as is now available because of this program. Our usual procedure for handling drug and alcohol users and sellers was to reprimand, counsel, suspend, send to outside agencies, and finally, expel. Early intervention is now a part of our treatment. We hope to expand our efforts in a massive prevention program with the help of the Institute.

3. Members of the school team used the techniques learned at the Adelphi University National Training Institute to end a chronic and severe discipline problem on a school bus that included the slicing of bus

seats by students, holes burnt in the seats of the bus, students smoking marijuana on the bus, and students physically abusing the school bus driver. All prior attempts to resolve the problem by traditional methods of discipline, including student detentions, suspensions, parental conferences and removal of bus privileges for some students had been futile. Shortly after their return from the ten day residential training, two members of the school team took on the challenge. They used their newly learned skills to build a support team of ten students chosen at random from students on the bus and to work with the bus driver. In the ten weeks since they met with the students and the driver there have been no discipline problems, no vandalism, and no smoking of marijuana. The atmosphere on the bus has changed dramatically, and the driver and the students are more receptive to the needs of each other.

4. The school team has worked with classroom teachers to help solve individual class problems. In one case, they used the techniques learned through the training to help solve a racial problem between black and white students in a girls' gym class. The class of thirty-six students were constantly fighting, were unwilling to take the class, refused to follow teacher directions, and a majority of students, both black and white, were failing. By the use of micro-labs, fish bowling, problem solving, teacher/student contracts and other innovative techniques learned at the training center, two school team members effected positive change. At this time, all racial strife has ceased; all the students are passing, and the teacher and students have developed a working measure of respect for each other. The teacher and class continue to use the problem solving procedures to ensure compliance with their contract.

The same techniques have been used with ninth grade students in an academic English class where students were acting out, causing them to be put out of class and being given detentions and suspensions. In the two weeks since the school team members worked with the teacher and the class there have been no office referrals. By increasing trust and cooperation among students and staff, we expect the school climate to improve, and therefore see a reduction in drug and alcohol abuse and other disruptive behavior.

In the elementary school whose staff participated in the training, the school team has developed a plan to staff a room as a guidance center

with teacher volunteers. Nine teachers have volunteered their free time to staff the room and to take additional training in counseling techniques. This effort is our start into prevention. We need additional, intensive team training from the Institute to spread this work into all ten elementary schools. The future of our long-range effort is dependent on broad-scale prevention activities.

In the junior high, the staff is just starting to develop new programs. They have involved students and other teachers. Junior high problems are always the most difficult to resolve. We have tried many different in-service consultants through the years. None hold the promise of achieving lasting results to the extent offered by the Institute.

In our Title I program, school team members have developed a Parent Advisory Group Think Tank. This group has effectively begun using the problem solving model to increase Title I parent participation in meetings and conferences. Some of our disadvantaged youngsters are particularly susceptible to illicit enticements. The procedures fostered by the Institute generate a total support-group feeling which encourages resistance to unhealthy blandishments.

And last, our school district cluster has presented a mini-workshop on the Adelphi University National Training Institute program to the Bucks County Intermediate Unit Superintendent's Council which represents thirteen school districts. The mini-workshop was requested because other school districts heard of the success of our new program. Continuation of the funding for the Institute will allow our team members to receive advanced training so that they can help other school districts, and other community groups. Vital assistance is required of the Institute to reach our next goal: developing a total community commitment to the delivery of human services.

The question raised by this report of program success, is why is the National Training Institute program effective?

I believe that a major reason for the success and effectiveness of these newly implemented programs is the school team approach. Participants, after completing the ten day residential training have developed a feeling of community and support for other members of the school team. This sense of community allows school team members to "dare" to try

innovative approaches to problem identification and problem solving. Knowing they have the support and the resources of other team members, participants are less afraid of failure. In our district, that support team quickly expanded beyond the original participants to include other administrators, teachers and students who are now involved in the new programs.

A second reason the school team training approach is successful is the design of the ten day residential setting. The participants are totally immersed, without distraction, in the content of the workshop, allowing time for the development of needed skills, techniques, knowledge and attitude.

The training design allowed time for participants to test and try their newly learned skills in the protected setting of the workshop with the training staff acting as guides and offering positive criticism and encouragement. This afforded participants a confidence they would not have otherwise possessed when they returned to their home school setting. Also, all staff members of the Adelphi University National Training Institute are professional. They know what they are doing and know how to do it in an efficient and effective manner.

As to our goals for the next few years:

1. We expect that, in Bristol Township, the number of teachers, administrators, students and parents, trained in the school team approach will grow as the successes of the program become even better known.

2. We expect these new techniques, skills and knowledge to foster the development of innovative and relevant programs that will be more effective in preventing and intervening in the problems of youngsters than the traditional methods now in use.

3. We expect that administrators, teachers, other staff, students and citizens will build a supportive community through purposeful interaction as defined by the skills and techniques fostered by the Institute.

4. We expect that students who are experiencing meaningful participation in a positive atmosphere will be less likely to experience the type of frustration that leads to drug and alcohol abuse and other disruptive behavior such as vandalizing school property, fighting, dropping out of school and alienating adults.

In order to accomplish our goals in Bristol Township, it is important that the National Training Institute remains intact. We are ready to enter a second phase of our program which involves training our own staff to act as trainers for other school personnel and the community. We need the help of the National Training Institute Staff to provide the additional advanced training needed for our participants so we may be self-sufficient in expanding our program.

Our experience has convinced us that this program should be available to other school districts. The program is comprehensive in that its methods not only are effective in dealing with drug and alcohol abuse, but also all other forms of disruptive and anti-social behavior. It is cost effective as is evidenced by the savings of dollars that have already been experienced in the few short months that programs have been in place in Bristol Township. Use of the techniques and skills can mean a positive change in school district and community attitudes.

We have concerns that the funding for the program should not be placed in Block Grants for the States. To do so would be to dilute the effectiveness that has been achieved through the National Training Institutes. The expertise, skill, ability and knowledge of the National Training Institute staff is not matched by state personnel. The concentration of the funds in the National Training Institute permits greater efficiency and effectiveness. We also feel that it is necessary to continue the funding at least at its present level of three million dollars.

In summary, I wish to thank this Senate Subcommittee for considering Bristol Township's endorsement of continued funding for the National Training Institute. We know the team approach is effective and cost-efficient. We have a long way to go before realizing our over-all goals. It will require the continued professional assistance of the Institute for the kind of progress we need to finally institutionalize the prevention of unhealthy, destructive behavior among our young.

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you, Mr. Kaufman.

I am curious to know about how this thing works. We sort of circled this whole issue here. But just exactly what happens in the schools, and what is the effect on the community as a whole?

You talked about declines in truancy, and other kinds of obnoxious behavior, but is it necessarily correlated with the decline in drug use?

I assume in your schools it is principally marihuana. So will you tell me, Mr. Boyd, how it works in Fort Worth? Just exactly what these programs do.

Mr. BOYD. All I can tell you is——.

Senator HUMPHREY. How do you do it?

Mr. BOYD. Sir?

Senator HUMPHREY. What happens out there?

Mr. BOYD. What happens?

Senator HUMPHREY. You train these teachers, they come back, what do they do? These counselors?

Mr. BOYD. They come back with an action plan which may focus on one or many things. Let me give you one instance.

For example, this one school was having a problem of fights in the crowded halls of the high school. It was a high school that we had to be careful with, because they were developing ethnic problems. They were about at a boiling point, and we were watching it very carefully, and these fights in the halls were not helping the matter.

We trained student teams, and the student teams decided they had a solution. The student team wanted to draw a line down the middle of the hall and, kids would walk the right side, and on the other side of the line pupils would walk in the other direction. It sounded too simple, but they made it work.

They put a tape down the middle of the hall. It stopped the fighting. Actually, what is going on is this. School teaming has gotten so effective that we went out and trained more teams. We train on weekends, twice a month. In 1 high school we trained 13 teams. They went back and implemented 13 action plans. And the same school trained 11 student teams which implemented 11 action plans.

Some of our student teams are meeting in the summer and training. Our school teams are trained at the outdoor learning center, it is on the lake, it is booked up each month. Teams are out there drawing up those action plans, to bring about change in the school. All of them have some different approach to reducing drug abuse and improving the schools.

Let me give you an example. I almost got into a dispute with a board member, who did not understand this. The team put up graffiti paper in the rest room because the girls were writing on the walls. They put up paper, and it seemed to solve the problem. They cleaned up the language and wrote on the paper instead of the walls. That may sound irrelevant to drug abuse prevention but it is not in that school.

I would not recommend this solution to another school with another set of conditions. Each school has its own unique problems and irritants and only the people on the scene are aware and capable of identifying the problems and causes that can lead to

more extreme destructive behaviors such as drug abuse. For example, even in families with marital problems, counseling often reveals that unsuspecting minor irritants are causing larger problems, and so it is with the schools. It is the often unnoticed irritants that need to be dealt with and the people who are experiencing the irritants and problems are the best equipped for dealing with them. This is what the school team program does through its action planning; improve those conditions that enhance the well-being of everyone.

Let me give you one example. I went over—we were training about 10 teams, I went over to one elementary teacher, and they were talking about the flower fund in the elementary school, and I got exasperated, but I did not let them know it. I wondered what did this have to do with preventing destructive behaviors?

I found out, for the past 12 years the flower fund had not been done equitably in that school, and people were mad. They were not working well together, they did not have a sense of community, and they could not solve any kind of problem. But now they were becoming a part of the solution.

Let me tell you what a school in trouble looks like. In a troubled school, the kids are disruptive, they may be using drugs, they are doing a lot of negative things. The teachers are closing the doors to their classrooms, and showing a lack of responsibility and ownership to all of this. Only doing their own thing, in their own room. The principal is being inappropriately autocratic. Autocratic behavior is fine in many instances, but not when it reduces problem solving to one person. Everyone has to help make the schools better.

What we are talking about here is how the school team program helps to spread responsibility. A teacher in Dallas said, "If I am walking down the hall and I see a trash basket on fire, I will not refuse to put out the fire just because I am not a fireman." Through the school team program the classroom doors are coming open and the teachers are assuming responsibility for problem solving in the whole school. The principal is learing to trust a lot more people. Five or six action plans may be operating in the school, because there is trust. What is going on in the schools? Teachers and students and members of the community are meeting and taking action to improve the school. And that is why the school team approach is so exciting.

I think that what you see people doing in the schools where there are school teams, is participating in making the school better. And succeeding. And that is where happiness comes in. Through the success. Happiness is not in an idea, happiness is when you are succeeding. And when you see happy schools you see a reduction in drug abuse and other destructive behaviors.

Did I answer your question?

Senator HUMPHREY. Partially.

Mr. BOYD. Do you remember it?

Senator HUMPHREY. Let me pursue it further.

Mr. BOYD. You asked me what they did in the schools?

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, but what is the essence of this thing? You talk about action plans, and routines, and training people,

what are they doing out there? What is the essence of the problem, and how do you solve it?

Do you want to take a crack at that, Ms. Barrick?

Ms. BARRICK. I see the whole process as being one that gets at problems that are within the school setting, that a principal cannot handle alone; neither can the teachers handle those problems individually. There needs to be a meeting of the minds, and by the processes that the teams go through, and eventually most of the faculty, the school staff becomes able to relate to each other in a more caring manner. Teachers have problems as well as students, and at this particular time many educators feel that they are being looked down upon, and are not held in the highest esteem.

I think the school team concept allows a faculty to look at the problems within a faculty, within a school setting that maybe do not relate directly to the students. Then they begin to look at what is wrong with the school, or what is right with the school, and how to make it better. Those are the kinds of things that take place.

If you look at item 1 included in my written testimony, there are listed the kinds of activities implemented in the schools with teams. Some teams worked on solving tardy problems, and others did a needs assessment. They learned how to do a needs assessment that involved every faculty member in that school. If everyone has had a part in making the decisions about what will be done, they are more likely to give their support. Some other programs have worked on discipline problems. All of us are aware that discipline is the No. 1 problem in the public schools. Drug taking is the second problem. They are very related. You cannot separate one from the other. I have mentioned the peer counseling programs. The faculties have had faculty-family retreats, and we have provided for training of trainers' workshops, hoping that we are able to provide training for others in our system.

We do have a few people, a cadre of trainers that could help us. We have a problem, though, in getting these trainers released from school. We work in conflict resolution.

One of the problems within our school system is the court mandate for desegregation that we have had placed upon us. We must, in each school, work toward multicultural education, for which our teams are giving leadership in developing programs.

If I did not answer your question—if you will be more specific, I will try again.

Senator HUMPHREY. I want to ask Mr. Kaufman, I am getting the picture here, angle by angle.

Presumably in these schools, where your people have had the benefits of training, at one of the regional centers, you have an advantage that other schools do not have, which enables you to solve your problems. What is that advantage? What is the problem?

It sounds to me like you are developing ways of communicating. Is that the essence of it, providing positive activities?

Mr. KAUFMAN. Absolutely, sir.

By getting very close, but the problem, as I face day by day, somewhat more removed from the classroom than these folks, is that folks who are taking drugs, coming to school somewhat tipsy, drinking, get into fights, whatever kinds of disruptive behavior, it

is getting in the way of learning. It is difficult to live that way each day, most of us are sick and tired, we want to do something about it, and we want to get rid of it, if we can.

The usual way of getting rid of it is to throw the kids out of school. It does not work any more. We are not even allowed to do it any more. There is much earlier intervention, because they know how to do it. We did not know how to do it before.

We know how to get to a youngster, without intimidating him, or throwing him out of the school, as our only means. We know how to help one another, to be able to talk to the parents of this youngster, who says we are picking on him. He is not the only one.

How can we talk to each other without picking on each other? The teams are learning. The institute is helping to be learned.

I happen to have become a better educator with the exposure that I have had. They work directly in the school, that is another thing, not in the offices. They work with the folks who are facing the problem. That is another major difference, rather than directives being issued from my office, saying this is no good, get rid of it.

To me, the essence is that the teams have skills and procedures and techniques that they use on a daily basis to attack the problems in the buildings.

Senator HUMPHREY. What are these in the area of curbing drug abuse? Do you have anything involving reverse peer pressure, or whatever you call it?

Mr. KAUFMAN. Yes, as an example, in a gym class where there is ample opportunity for the exchange of drugs and other kinds of things, where we had initially identified what we thought was a racial conflict problem, girls' gym class. Teams of that high school utilized a variety of techniques that had been learned at Adelphi, to bring the teacher, who was suffering almost total breakdown in that class, together, where they worked out a contract as to how they were going to live a little more happily together in that class.

There has developed from that, I do not know what word to use, snitchers, or whatever, where we have been able to find some of the sellers in the building, directly coming from that experience, and the youngsters do not look upon themselves as snitchers. That is why I was looking for a word.

I do not know what it was. They felt they were contributing as citizens, they wanted to get rid of it, and the racial conflict has toned down. They are dressing for class, they are going to class, and the drugs are not being passed in that locker room.

Senator HUMPHREY. So in other words, the regional training centers share some proven techniques in overcoming common problems that schools have with youngsters?

Mr. KAUFMAN. Proven and practical. They work fast.

Senator HUMPHREY. Why aren't these techniques recognized, and widely known? Why is it necessary to have a Regional Center?

Mr. KAUFMAN. Because it is too separated. You take courses in credits. You go from one course to another, and there is no amount, as I spoke of, of the information that comes from the different fields that impact on it. This is the only instance of the program that has made this kind of amalgam possible. It becomes imbued in the problem. It is part of the guts.

Senator HUMPHREY. You are a superintendent of schools. Are the Institutions training teachers nowadays beginning to incorporate this kind of thing into their basic curriculum?

Mr. KAUFMAN. On a small and limited scale. They are facing some of the problem that we are, ability to develop new programs.

The amount of time that they can devote to the so-called extension, or extensive training, is quite limited, plus these folks are not directly in the fields at the time that they are receiving the training.

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, what about the involvement of outside groups, like—service organizations, parents, groups of concerned parents? Do you incorporate anything like that, Mr. Boyd?

Mr. BOYD. Yes, we do, in every way we can, and once again that is pretty complex.

One thing is, in our particular State, our Governor is working real hard on a program that started down in Florida, parents, peer programs. I am sure you have heard of that.

I am cooperating, from my office, on that, going everywhere I can, supporting it in every way possible. One of the ways we do it, though, is we work on other kinds of problems. Our school district is responsive to our total community needs.

One thing we just did, in cooperation with 60-some agencies, we targeted, on one of the most poverty ridden black areas in our city. We selected that area, and we are piloting a program where the schools and, all 60 agencies cooperate, to see what we can do to impact that area and help the school aged kids get back in school and off drugs.

I would like to make a remark, Senator Humphrey, in regard to some theory of why this works.

I am not sure we know exactly why, but I think we can get close. Senator Humphrey, one reason people use drugs is because they cannot find a way to be happy any other way. And happiness seems to come from some kind of success, and from giving and receiving love.

Sometimes we make it hard for people to be successful in a constructive way. We do not intend to sabotage people, but sometimes even our own philosophies are wrong because we say we will make conditions tough so the people will be tough.

What this program does, is it helps people find ways to be successful in constructive ways. When the pain of frustration gets too great, one might go out and find some other way to be happy even in self-destructive ways. This program is seeking in a very happy, cooperative way to make it easier for kids to find constructive instead of destructive ways to cope with life. Senator Humphrey, I think the finest thing in the world, you could do would be to participate in the actual training and be there where this program is operating in a school.

We all tried here today to help this program by explaining its virtues. But the program is hard to explain. What we are talking about is how to help students or any one succeed over frustration without resorting to seriously destructive behavior. It applies even to you and me, Senator Humphrey. For example, the daily frustration of driving to work and parking and dealing with staff. When the skills for coping successfuly are not there then one might turn

to the comfort of chemicals or other seductive and self-destructive behaviors.

But I am going to add to what I said a little while ago, this program provides school people with an opportunity to sit down together and establish what you said, communication, but beyond that to do this wonderful exciting thing, of finding out that we can succeed, and we can succeed tomorrow, and we can believe in ourselves deeply, and we can share that success with others, and no longer do teachers have to close their doors and just give up on everything, while the kids go wild.

We have a new basis in believing and sharing responsibility based on the success that begins right in that first training session.

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you.

Ms. Barrick, as the last question, can you give me, or us, some—one or two specific examples of the programs that you have implemented as a result of what your counselors and teachers have learned at these regional training centers? Specifically, in the area—especially in the area of drug abuse.

We know there are a lot of allied problems, but do you—have you set up programs specifically designed to try to persuade kids to stay away from that stuff?

Ms. BARRICK. I probably will have to answer no, because research supports the fact that programs that just use facts about drugs will not deter and will not change behavior. We had a consultant from the Office of Education with one of our peer counseling teams this week, and these are some of the things that she found out and discussed with me. The students are talking with each other about such problems as abortion, running away from home, even one child has talked about suicide. These are the kinds of problems indirectly related to drugs. Of course, peer counselors and tutors are not trained to give advice. They are trained to listen and to learn how to suggest alternatives, and to help persons deal with their problems.

Of course, they are also trained, that when it is a serious problem, to seek help immediately. When a student talks about problems that are serious, they are crying for help, so this is a form of intervention, that I think has a wonderful chance of helping our schools.

I think we should not forget one thing. In our schools, our greatest numbers in resources happen to be our students. We should use them, because as public education is receiving less and less funds, we need to use every available resource within out school setting. Students need the responsibility, and many of them can accept the responsibility of helping to make the school a better place, thus hopefully drug free.

One thing that we have not mentioned, that I think we should mention is that we know drug abuse in our society is escalating. When children come to school, the drug problem is not left at home. So that means that we in public education are having to fight a lot of variables from the community, and that exist within our country.

Senator HUMPHREY. I quite agree, and I think you ought to be complaining about that, because I do not think it is exclusively the province of the schools to be fighting these battles, and it would be

a mistake for you to try to do so, and that is why I am particularly happy to see the emergence of so many of these parent groups recently.

Ms. BARRICK. We feel very good about our parents' group.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, thank you all for coming. Your testimony was very helpful.

We were listening carefully, and we will proceed on the basis of what we have heard, and other things, as well.

As a matter of fact, we would like—I would like to ask this. We want to submit some further questions for the record, if we may. But what I would like particularly, is a list of four or five programs that you have instituted as a result of the training that these centers have provided your people. The name of the program, what it does, what its results are, and so on.

I think we are a little short of that kind of information at this point.

Ms. BARRICK. Are you asking us to do that?

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes.

Ms. BARRICK. In one of our schools we have a program——

Senator HUMPHREY. I am going to submit those in writing for your reply, if you do not mind. The record will remain open for 15 days for the submission of additional material, including information specifically requested by the subcommittee during this mornings hearings.

The subcommittee stands adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.

Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 11:55 a.m., the subcommittee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]

○